

16

# THE LONDON QUARTERLY & HOLBORN REVIEW

*Edited by J. Alan Kay, M.A., Ph.D.*

**JULY 1958**

*Contributors Include*

CHRISTIANITY AND THE ARTS

JOHN HESTER, M.A.  
CHARLES W. H. JOHNSON, M.A.  
EDWARD D. MILLS, F.R.I.B.A.  
JOSEPH POOLE, M.A.  
BASIL WILLEY, M.A., F.B.A., HON. LITT.D.

FRANK BAKER, B.A., B.D., PH.D.  
RUPERT E. DAVIES, M.A., B.D.  
G. THACKRAY EDDY, M.A., B.D.  
R. NEWTON FLEW, M.A., D.D.  
P. HADFIELD, M.A., B.D., PH.D., F.R.A.I.  
W. F. LOFTHOUSE, M.A., HON. D.D.  
CYRIL N. OGDEN  
LUDWIG ROTT  
GORDON S. WAKEFIELD, M.A., B.LITT.



**THE EPWORTH PRESS**

[FRANK H. CUMMINGTON UNIVERSITY

**25-35 CITY ROAD LONDON EC1**

*Four Shillings and Sixpence Net*

JUL 25 1958

LIBRARY

**THE LONDON QUARTERLY AND HOLBORN REVIEW**  
is published on 25th March, June, September and December. All contributions (typewritten, if possible) should be sent to the Editor, 25-35, City Road, London, E.C.1, with stamped addressed envelope.

### Contents

Editorial Comments by J. Alan Kay, M.A., PH.D.	161	Pascal's <i>Provincial Letters</i> , 1656-7 by G. Thackray Eddy, M.A., B.D.	202
Christianity and Literature by Basil Willey, M.A., F.B.A., HON. LITT.D.	166	Some Examples of New Testament Teaching Relevant to the Treatment of Stammering by Cyril N. Ogden	207
Drama—the Mirror of Truth by John Hester, M.A.	170	'Mad Grimshaw' and His Covenants with God by Frank Baker, B.A., B.D., PH.D.	211
Painting and Sculpture by Charles W. H. Johnson, M.A.	175	Iranian Influences on Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic by P. Hadfield, M.A., B.D., PH.D.	216
Christianity and Architecture by Edward D. Mills, F.R.I.B.A.	180	Oliver Cromwell by Gordon S. Wakefield, M.A., B.LITT.	221
Music in Christian Liturgy by Joseph W. Poole, M.A.	184	Recent Literature Edited by R. Newton Flew, M.A., D.D.	226
Gottlob Müller: In Memoriam by Ludwig Rott	187	From My New Shelf by R. Newton Flew, M.A., D.D.	232
Karl Barth's Doctrine of God by W. F. Lofthouse, M.A., HON. D.D.	190	Our Contributors	240
St Cyprian of Carthage by Rupert E. Davies, M.A., B.D.	198		

## **THEIR SECURITY DEPENDS ON YOU!**

- ★ The security of a happy home is the right of every child.
- ★ Our family purse must ever grow to meet the increasing needs of all our children and to help us to take more needy girls and boys into our care.
- ★ The League of Light helps to keep our income regular. All members have to do is to promise to give or collect 10/6, which is only 2½d. a week. An attractive lantern box is provided.
- ★ Please let us send you fuller particulars, write to:

THE PRINCIPAL, [REV. J. W. WATERHOUSE, M.A., B.D.]

**National Children's Home**

Chief Offices: Highbury Park, London, N.5

=  
7  
-  
,  
  
2  
  
7  
  
.





## *Editorial Comments*

### CHRISTIANITY AND THE ARTS

THERE has always been a close connexion between religion and art. It has indeed been held by a number of competent authorities that all forms of art originated in worship, and although, as Professor Yrjö Hirn has pointed out, this goes too far, it is certainly true that there is a very early connexion between the two activities.

Music played a large part in primitive religion, and Western music owes its development very largely to the Church; as Walford Davies says, 'a guess may be hazarded that one fourth if not one third of all the best music at our disposal today is in some real sense Church music.' Dancing has a long connexion with worship; many savage dances were religious, the dancing of the early Greeks was offered to the gods, Hebrew dancing was an act of worship, and parts of the Christian Church, in various places and at various times (including our own), have also used the dance in their ritual. Drama was very early connected with religion; in primitive life it was a natural development from dancing, which as we have said was an act of worship, among the Semites it was always essentially religious, among the Greeks it began as a religious observance, and in our own country it originated in the medieval religious plays. The greatest glories of architecture and most of its earliest surviving examples are buildings set up for religious use. Painting and sculpture have well-known early connexions with religious worship, and in various ways and degrees are still employed in it. Finally, poetry has been commonly used for religious purposes from the beginning—by savage tribes, by pagan cultures, by the early Hebrews, by the writing prophets, by Jesus Himself, and by the Church right up to the present day.

The fact that art and religion have been so constantly linked together suggests very strongly that there is an essential connexion between them, and that connexion will be found mainly in the fact that art is a natural vehicle for expressing and communicating two things—intuitions of God and right attitudes towards Him.

It is one of the functions of art to express and communicate intuitions. The artist does not express himself in the indirect, discursive and inferential ways of ordinary statement, but sets down his direct awareness of things; he does not present us with mere ideas or reasonings or statements of observed fact, but gives us the immediacy of his experience. In his picture we not only see but feel the movement of the corn, the roughness of the stonework and the character of the persons; he does not merely tell us what these qualities are; he gives us direct contact with them. In the religious realm we often draw a distinction between knowing about God and knowing God, between being convinced intellectually of His existence and having direct contact with Him. It is this knowing by direct contact with which art is concerned, and that it is by its very nature peculiarly fitted to help us to know God in that way we shall see if we now examine some of the intuitions which all great art in some measure gives.

First, great art gives to us the experience of being in the presence of that which is beyond the realms of matter, place and time, of that which is omnipresent spirit, infinite, ultimate. Aldous Huxley has said that 'The best works of literary,

plastic and musical art furnish us with information . . . about the ultimate reality behind appearance'. No doubt that is an inadequate way of putting it, and certainly the word 'information' is questionable; but the experience he is trying to describe is well enough known. No one can enter into the meaning of Fra Angelico's picture of the Annunciation (the well-known one in San Marco, Florence) without feeling it. Mary is seated under a portico on a wooden stool with her hands crossed over her breast, and the angel kneels before her with his own hands in the same posture of humility. As one contemplates the arc of his glorious wings stretched out behind him, one has the inescapable feeling that their great curve cuts across not only the pillars of the portico, but the whole picture, and not only the whole picture, but the world which is beyond its frame and even the immensity of space which is beyond that; it is indeed an arc of the universe, and runs through all things. Something like that is true of all great works of art. We who are imprisoned in the darkness of the local and the present and the material find that it throws open the windows of our little cell and lets in the light that floods and penetrates the whole universe. Its meaning is not that of paint or stone or sound or words or movements, but of a Spirit which both penetrates and transcends all things.

Secondly, the reality thus revealed is one by which we are governed and controlled. A work of art cannot be made to order; it may involve a great deal of planning and hard work, and yet it is not the result merely of planning and hard work. It is not subject to the artist's will; it has a life of its own; it follows principles which the artist does not lay down himself, but which he finds have been laid down for him. It is as much discovered as it is created, as much received as it is constructed. The artist is very conscious of all this: Goethe felt that his songs had him in their power; George Eliot spoke of a 'not herself' which took possession of her; Elgar considered that he was the 'all but unconscious medium' by which his works came into being. It is not surprising, therefore, that this sense of being in touch with a power greater than man and controlling him becomes expressed in the work which the artist makes. One of G. D. Cunningham's organ pupils was once startled when the great man came to the organ console after listening down the church to his playing of Bach's great G minor fugue and said, 'Bach didn't compose that.' 'What do you mean?' said the pupil. 'I mean,' said Cunningham, 'that it came to him straight from Heaven.' If that meant that it was not necessary for Bach to do any hard work on it, then, of course, it was nonsense; but if it meant that the music obviously came from a source altogether greater than even Bach himself, a source of which it is more true to say that it controlled him than that he controlled it, then it was no more than a straightforward statement of the feeling which his music so often produces.

Thirdly, this reality is good and acceptable, indeed lovable—or, as we more usually say in this connexion, lovely. This does not mean that the ugly and the evil have no place in art—the dwarfs of Velazquez, the discords of Scriabin, the gargoyles of medieval carvers all deny that. What it does mean is that a work of art shows to us a universe which is at its lowest acceptable and at its highest magnificent. The play of *Hamlet* faces most of the gross evils which are to be found in the world—incest, adultery, treachery, murder, suicide, poison, the sword, drowning, madness, decay, death. One would suppose that a play which

dealt with all these things would be thoroughly depressing; but we do not come away from it feeling that existence is a miserable affair, but that it is wonderful and magnificent. Paul Claudel once said, 'Long before I was a Christian, I heard the Ninth Symphony of Beethoven and a chorus from Sophocles, and I knew that everlasting joy was at the heart of reality.' Art does not always reach such heights as that, but it is faulty as art if it does not bring the experience that the heart of reality is at least acceptable, and even art of only moderate importance can give an experience which is much more positive than that.

Fourthly, this reality is perfect, that is, complete and whole. The work of art is a unified pattern; every part of it makes a contribution; nothing is irrelevant; nothing is out of place; nothing is without meaning; nothing hangs loose and detached; everything is part of a design—that is to say, part of a purpose. It is infinitely various, but all the variety is joined into one whole. A Gothic cathedral is tied together like a parcel by its vertical lines and its horizontal string courses; a work in music is made one by its repetitions and inversions and contrasts, and by its return to the key from which it set out; a drawing is so made that its lines carry the eye from one part to another and join the whole work into one; a piece of sculpture has its masses balanced one against another; a story (whether in prose, verse, drama, or ballet) coheres in all its parts, and at the end it does not merely stop, but is brought to a conclusion. In a work of art there is nothing incomplete and there is nothing otiose. It is said that a friend visited Michelangelo and asked what he had been doing in his studio that morning. He replied, 'I have altered that curve and brought out that muscle.' 'But these are mere trifles,' said the friend. 'Maybe,' replied the sculptor. 'But I was working for perfection, and perfection is no trifle.' A work of art is a representation of perfection; and since it is at the same time felt to be the expression of a spiritual reality which is its ultimate author and controller, it gives us an intuition of that reality as itself perfect.

The intuitions which it is natural for art to give us, therefore, are that we are in contact with Ultimate Reality, and that that Reality is a spirit which is omnipresent, infinite, controlling, 'good and acceptable and perfect'. It should be noticed that there is nothing personal here, and that we are still a long way from the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. Yet these are His attributes and belong to no one and nothing else. It is not surprising that Christianity, together with the other religions of the world, should find in art an affinity to its own experiences. Moreover, what we have been considering is not art which is specifically religious, let alone Christian, but art of any kind. In religious art these intuitions can be emphasized, in Christian art they can be added to, and when a devout Christian artist takes a Christian subject he will, of course, express his own Christian intuitions. It is clear that, although art can express and communicate intuitions of any kind, it is a natural vehicle for many of those which are bound up with the experience of God.

Let us now turn to art as a vehicle for expressing and communicating religious attitudes of mind. To express attitudes of mind is, of course, art's main business. In the non-representative arts, such as music and architecture, this is not difficult for the ordinary man to accept; but it applies equally to the representative ones. Representative art is not mere imitation of life, but imitation with comment. Every representation is in principle like a caricature; that is to say, it

portrays not only the subject, but the subject together with the artist's attitudes towards it. The attitudes expressed, however, are not only to the subject; there is the attitude to the material which is used (paint, canvas, stone, words, musical instruments); there is the artist's attitude to himself, his nature, instincts, experiences, emotions; there is his attitude to his audience, spectators or readers; where his work has a definite purpose, there is his attitude towards that purpose; and above all there is his general attitude to life and existence as a whole, which colours everything he does. As Clutton Brock once said: 'Art is the expression of a certain attitude towards reality.' If the attitudes expressed are good (and, of course, if the expression of them is good also), the art will be good; if they are bad, the art will be bad. The attitudes expressed in good art are, of course, infinitely various, but there are a few generalizations which can be made. Among them, the following are relevant for our purpose.

First, one essential attitude is respect. The good artist sees both things and people as having worth in themselves and for their own sake. He is conscious that they do not exist merely to serve his ends, but have independent qualities and values of their own. He therefore treats them with the respect due to them, which may be anything from Epstein's recognition of the capacities of stone to the Byzantines' veneration for the majesty of Christ, and from respect for an audience to reverence for the ways of God.

Secondly, there is sincerity. There are several senses in which an artist must be sincere. One is that he must be honest with his audience: he may give them fiction, as much of it as he wishes, but he must not try by doing so to delude them; he may imitate nature and do so as closely as he likes, but not with the intention of deceiving them. He must be sincere, too, about the feeling expressed: he must not try to persuade them that he is deeply moved when in fact he is quite calm; he must not try to amuse them by a joke which he himself does not find entertaining. Another aspect of the artist's sincerity is that he must speak the truth about life: if he sets out to give a serious picture of it, he must show it as he knows it to be, observing, for instance, the laws of cause and effect. When Balzac was begged to save some wild young man or unhappy woman among his creatures, he would answer, 'Don't bother me. Truth above all. These people have no backbone. What happens to them is inevitable.' Yet a further aspect of sincerity is that the artist must not deceive himself; he must not delude himself, for example, into thinking that he is thrilled with a sunset when in fact he only *wants* to be thrilled with a sunset. A great work of art is not produced by a man who is pretending to himself, not even if his pretence is unconscious.

Thirdly, the artist's attitude to himself is one of detachment. He treats himself and his skill in that objective kind of way in which he treats his other material, putting himself into the picture when his presence is relevant and leaving himself out when it is not, exhibiting his skill when such exhibition will serve his purpose and concealing it when it will not. Dryden may talk freely about himself in the Preface to the *Fables*, but not in the *Fables* themselves; the soloist in a concerto may exhibit his skill in the cadenza, but during the rest of the work his skill must be forgotten in the music. The only quality which can produce this detachment from self is humility—not the false humility which shuns the light for fear of being seen, but the genuine humility which will enter either the light or the dark so long as it may serve.

Fourthly, one of the most important attitudes in art is that of acceptance. The artist, contemplating life with a sensitive and honest mind, accepts it, and when we see through his eyes we accept it also. It is easy to see that there are varying degrees of acceptance; there is the whole-hearted kind which produces joy, the grudging kind which is resignation, and a multitude in between. Addison preferred beauty to be 'softened with an Air of Melancholy or Sorrow' and there have been many others who have felt the same; but the more whole-hearted the acceptance the better, and joy shows a fuller reconciliation with life than mere resignation. But complete acceptance is nothing less than love, and in the end it is love which the greatest artists communicate to us. The poet's state of mind, says C. Day Lewis, 'is the heightened sensibility of one who is in love'.

Among the attitudes which are necessary to great art, therefore, are the greatest of the Christian virtues. Thus we have here again a clear link between not only art and religion, but art and the Christian religion—and this not in art which is specifically Christian, but in art of any kind. In Christian art these attitudes can be emphasized and added to, and in works which have a religious subject they will include attitudes towards God. Any attitudes can be expressed and communicated in art, but in good art those we have already mentioned will already in some degree be present.

Art is thus an ideal vehicle for expressing and communicating intuitions of God and right attitudes towards Him. It can be a medium for intuitions and attitudes of any kind. If they are bad intuitions and bad attitudes, it will be bad art; but as we have seen, if it is good art, some of the right intuitions and attitudes will be present in any case. If it is Christian art, then the intuitions and attitudes will be fully Christian, and those who use it will be able to receive through it the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and to offer through it the worship of Christian disciples.

---

Would any reader possessing a spare copy of the January 1945 issue of the *LONDON QUARTERLY & HOLBORN REVIEW* please communicate with the Secretary of the Library, University Library, Cambridge.



## CHRISTIANITY AND LITERATURE

READERS OF *The Autobiography of Mark Rutherford* will remember that when he was minister of the Water Lane Meeting one of his duties was to read aloud selected passages of literature at Mr and Mrs Snale's Dorcas gatherings. The business on these occasions was weekday and secular, so the Bible was excluded; but so, also, were 'books on topics altogether worldly'. This meant that the minister was virtually limited to the denominational journals, and, finding these distasteful, Mark Rutherford, greatly daring, read one day some passages from *The Vicar of Wakefield*. For this he was taken to task by the deacon, 'because, you know, Mr Rutherford, the company is mixed, and perhaps, Mr. Rutherford, a book with a more requisite tone might be more suitable on such an occasion'. The hard-pressed minister next tried George Fox's *Journal*, only to be told that 'although Mr Fox might be a very good man, and a converted character, yet he did not, you know, Mr Rutherford, belong to us'.

Anyone brought up in a Puritan community, and old enough to remember its ethos as recently as fifty years ago, will recognize the truth of Mark Rutherford's picture. I remember how once, when I was a very small boy, a Methodist minister, surveying my father's bookshelves on one of his pastoral visits, shook his head with sorrow and astonishment when he saw there the novels of Thomas Hardy. And I have elsewhere related the comment on Shakespeare by an aged great-uncle of mine (a Plymouth Brother, it is true): 'Shakespeare? What did *he* know about the spiritual life?' There is no need to enlarge upon the Puritan tradition of hostility to the arts and to everything belonging to the life of *Homo naturalis*, or upon its suspicion of 'artistic' people as sons of Belial.

But this tradition is much older than Puritanism, if by Puritanism we mean what Matthew Arnold called the prison-house into which the spirit of England entered after the Reformation, to have the key turned upon it there for 200 years. It is at least as old as Plato, who, as everybody knows, banished from his ideal Republic all poetry and music except the religious and martial kinds—those kinds, that is, which would enhance the piety or stiffen the moral fibre of the citizens. The Early Christian Church, too, was hard put to it to justify the reading of the ancient pagan classics. Was it not the mission of Christianity to deliver mankind from the corruptions and vain imaginings of the Gentiles? Tertullian denounced stage plays as idolatrous, and condemned the sweetness of verse and melody as the devil's bait, or 'drops of honey from a venomous reptile'. The Church afterwards came to terms with classical literature, largely by treating it as allegory (as, most notably, in the case of Vergil's *Aeneid*); but St Jerome and St Augustine reproached themselves for never having lost the love of Cicero and Vergil which they had acquired in their youth. St Basil pointed the way out, in his *Address to Young Men on the Right Use of Greek Literature*, by arguing that we can exercise our spiritual perceptions upon profane writings 'in which we perceive the truth as it were in shadows and in mirrors'.

In England, at the time of the Reformation, the new Puritan temper dis-trusted literature and the arts not only as allurements of Satan, but as proceeding

mainly from that sink of iniquity, the continent of Europe, above all from Italy. Even Roger Ascham, who was no bigoted Puritan, feared the contaminating influence of Italian literature and Italian morals: 'Mo Papistes be made by your mery bookes of *Italie*, than by your earnest bookes of *Louvain*'. Ascham also attacked the mediaeval romances, 'made in Monasteries, by idle Monkes, or wanton Chanons: as one example, *Morte Arthure*: the whole pleasure of which booke standeth in open mans slaughter and bold bawdrie'. The feeling that poetry, and especially plays, made men effeminate and weakened their moral fibre, was expressed by Stephen Gosson in his *Schoole of Abuse* (1579)—the book which set Sir Philip Sidney upon writing his *Apologie for Poetry*.

Apology for poetry! a modern reader may exclaim: why should *poetry* need to be apologized for? Surely poetry, like music, painting, sculpture, and architecture, is one of the highest creative and spiritual activities of mankind? Who but sour and illiberal Puritans and kill-joys would condemn it? Well, I have just been trying to hint at the strength and persistence of the Christian case against the arts, and the dispute is even yet going on, though in a changed and much more sophisticated language. In the lifetime of some of us the issue was raised again, in a challenging form, by Tolstoy in his *What is Art?* (1896). Art, he argued, is merely a means of communication between human beings, and its value depends entirely upon the quality of what is communicated. There can be only two worthy aims for any art, in the view of anyone who considers the real meaning of human existence and understands the true proportions of things—namely, the heightening of our sense of dependence upon God, and the strengthening of our sense of brotherhood with all mankind. Applying this stringent test to the whole aesthetic output of Europe since the Renaissance, Tolstoy condemned nearly all of it (including his own masterpieces) as tending to pride, exclusiveness, and unbelief. Only certain simple ballads, folk-music, or a few books like *Uncle Tom's Cabin* and *The Christmas Carol* satisfied his requirements.

When we consider the literature of the past 2,000 years, or of the past 300 years, or more especially of the present age, we need not be Tolstoys to feel—at least at certain times and in certain moods—that not very much of it makes a contribution to the Christian life as such. Of the novels and plays and poems produced in our own generation, the immense majority ignore the problems confronting a practising Christian, or proceed as if religion did not count, or (either openly or implicitly) presuppose the non-existence or non-observance of Christian standards of conduct. 'It is always the writer's duty,' said Dr Johnson, 'to make the world better.' How many of our contemporary writers, or how many even of the writers of long-established reputation, really fulfil that duty?

Of course, this raises the highly complicated problem of the ways, if any, in which writers can make the world 'better'. 'Better' in what sense: morally, intellectually, spiritually? Can literature make people better citizens, or better individuals, in the sense of being people with richer interests, more flexible sympathies, livelier and more charming personalities? All through the ages there have been philosophers, critics and men of letters who, in opposition to the Platonists and Puritans of whatever brand, have claimed that the arts are of high value, and that they are valuable because, in some sense either simple or subtle, they 'do us good'. The old defenders of poetry, like Sidney, Dryden or



Johnson, used to claim that poetry instructed by pleasing, or taught by example; instead of laying down abstract principles like the moral philosopher, the poet gilds the ethical pill, 'with a tale forsooth he cometh to you', and by pleasant allurements wins your mind from wickedness to virtue. Shelley declared that poetry does us good, not by being openly didactic, but by enlarging our sympathies and by increasing that within us which is the source of all morality—our capacity for love. Wordsworth hoped that his poems might teach the young to think more deeply and feel more sensitively, and so become 'more actively and securely virtuous'. Matthew Arnold believed that poetry was salutary because, by familiarity with the best of it, we can be raised to the height of those great spirits—Homer, Sophocles, Dante, Shakespeare, Milton, Wordsworth—whose work has the movement and accent of truth and seriousness.

It is all very well to claim that literature can win the mind from vice to virtue; certainly it can win the mind, but it can as easily corrupt as edify it. It was precisely because he felt so strongly its power to sway the passions that Plato feared it. And the mention of Matthew Arnold may remind us that it was only the *very best* poetry that he prescribed as soul-medicine; the problem was, how to distinguish the best from the inferior kinds. It may also remind us of another important aspect of our theme, to which I shall return directly.

Literature and the other arts, like the human emotions and thoughts of which they are the expression, can be potent for good or for ill according to the spirit which informs them. There is nothing sacrosanct about 'literature' as such; like every human production it is a mixture of wheat and chaff, and must submit to the winnowing-fan of criticism. The winnowing process may be conducted on various levels: aesthetic, psychological, sociological, humanist, Christian. These criteria are confusingly interlocked, but one may point to the two extremes: those which judge value from within literature itself, using purely aesthetic standards; and those, like the Christian, which judge from without, ascribing 'goodness' only to those works which subserve Christian ends. Both methods have their dangers: the aesthetic, that of ascribing excessive value to a well-made trifle or to something corruptly beautiful; the Christian, that of underestimating what is not overtly religious, or of overestimating that which, though pious, is banal or hideous. There is such a thing as great Christian literature—witness Dante, Donne's *Divine Poems*, Milton, Bunyan, Hopkins—but such poetry is great not only because it is Christian. On the other hand, there is literature which is great without being Christian—witness the poets and tragedians of classical antiquity, and much of the work of nineteenth- and twentieth-century writers. With the latter, however, working as they have done within a tradition derived from Christianity, it is generally impossible to say how far their 'greatness' has Christian roots. Again, there is literature which, though 'good' in its Christian intention, is extremely bad as literature (I am afraid some hymn-books and ecclesiastical bookshops abound in examples); and the same is true of the other arts. If literature is to contribute something to the Christian life, as it certainly can, it must at least be literature to begin with. This once granted, the Christian critic is perfectly entitled to demand, further, that the work in question be spiritually good as well, or at least not destructive of Christian values. Thus any discerning critic must acknowledge the literary excellence of (say) Hardy and D. H. Lawrence; but a Christian critic, after acknowledging

this, might, without losing his critical integrity, feel obliged to warn his readers against their teaching. But the whole notion of 'Christian' criticism is dangerous; a critic is so apt to start being Christian before he has finished being critical. It is easy to forget that there are values such as joy, sincerity, freshness of vision, imagination, wit, brilliance, humour, technical mastery—which can be found in literature, and which are indispensable to the good life, but which cannot be said to 'contribute to Christianity' except in so far as *anything* does so which helps to give life and give it more abundantly.

I promised to return to another aspect suggested by the mention of Arnold. Literature, we have said, can be either the friend or the foe of Christianity; or it can be, so to speak, neutral. But it can also be used, as Arnold showed and urged, as a substitute for religion. The best part of our religion, he said, is its unconscious poetry, and much of what now passes for religion will be replaced by poetry. The notion of literature as 'Scripture', or as an *ersatz*-religion, arose in the nineteenth century through the solvent action of historical and scientific criticism upon the foundations of traditional certainties. Protestantism had been a book-religion, and now the authority of the Book was challenged. We must, said Jowett, treat the Bible 'like any other book'; and this meant, among other things, treating other books like Bibles. This quest for a pseudo-religion in secular literature has continued, since the days of Arnold and Jowett, amongst humanists and agnostics who, though estranged from official Christianity, have retained a nostalgia for its emotional uplift and consolation. Undoubtedly the best literature can uplift and console; it can deepen and enrich our lives through heightened awareness; it can revive our sense of meaning in existence; it can restore to us the wonder and loveliness of the world by removing the 'film of familiarity' from the face of common things. All these are functions of religion also. But because literature can mediate these and other religious values, we must not imagine that it can replace religion. It provides no firm ground of faith, no conviction of sin, no assurance of forgiveness, no means of grace, no regular call to worship, no discipline of the will and affections.

I said that Protestantism had been a 'book religion', and to the question 'What has literature contributed to Christianity?' the short answer is 'The Bible'—which means, for us, specifically the Authorized Version; and we ought to add, the beautiful and moving Collects of the *Book of Common Prayer*. There is no space—but there is also no need—to dwell upon the influence of the Bible upon the whole life and thought, the institutions, morals, politics and inmost spiritual life of the world. And no doubt part of that influence has been due to its literary excellence. The translators, thinking only of their duty to God and man, and making no self-conscious efforts after 'style', produced a prose which for candour, dignity, nobility and purity is—at its best—unsurpassed. One might well consider the English Bible, not as literature's contribution to Christianity, but as Christianity's contribution to literature. But the Bible would not have meant what in fact it has meant, if it had always been approached 'as literature'; if the response to it had been mainly aesthetic—a savouring of its fine language, an enjoyment of its dramatic and moving narratives, an appreciation of its sublime imagery. These qualities have merely reinforced its authority as Holy Scripture.

The drift of these remarks is to suggest that literature, by keeping the mind open and flexible, widening our sympathies, and sharpening our responses, can indeed make a vital contribution to the Christian life. But only *some* literature; only the *best*. And the life must be Christian first: literature cannot generate it. How to distinguish the 'best' literature from the inferior, the genuine from the counterfeit? There is no royal road to this insight, and the Christian must not imagine that a precipitate application of his own standards will serve instead of literary training and the exercise of an informed judgement. If, by the use of this trained judgement, he has pronounced a work to be good literature, he may then appeal to the Christian tribunal for a final verdict on its spiritual alignment.

BASIL WILLEY

---

## DRAMA—THE MIRROR OF TRUTH

PRINCE HAMLET in his talk with the strolling players reminds them that the object of acting 'both at the first, and now, was and is, to hold as 'twere the mirror up to nature'. All who love the art of drama, as did the sweet Prince himself, would surely agree that this should be the object not only of acting, but of playwriting and producing also. It is in fact the simple object of all drama. The Christian who prays daily that the Kingdom of God may come on earth as it is in heaven must be immediately interested in this, for he knows that there is no meaning in 'nature' except in the truths revealed by our Christian faith. So if the drama is or can be a practical mirror which will reflect those truths, he must by his Christian profession embrace the drama, and support it by active prayer and interest wherever it is fulfilling its true function.

There is a conflict at this point with much that is deep rooted in us as church-people. For centuries have passed since the Church and drama first suffered a prolonged separation, during much of which the face of puritanism was turned coldly away from what it sincerely believed to be an occasion of sin. Only during the last thirty out of some 300 years has the breach begun to mend. The prodigal has returned home. Yet many of his brethren not unnaturally resent his reappearance. How can the Church, they ask, have anything to do with plays, players, and playhouses, so long synonymous with irreligion and licentiousness? Was the attitude of seventeenth-century France not right, in insisting that Molière himself should be buried secretly and at night because he was a theatrical? Confident answers to these questions are vital for an extension of the

*rapprochement*, which is either most evil and dangerous, or necessary and according to the will of God.

The roots of drama as we know it in the Western world were set in a religious soil. First in time among the sources which produced our present-day drama was classical Greece, where each play was regarded as a religious ceremony by the immense crowds which took part as spectators. I deliberately say 'took part', because Greek theatre-goers were assistants in the drama to a degree which can today be compared only with the crowds who assist at the ritual of an integral Spanish bullfight. Those who have shared this experience will know the almost mystical phenomenon by which the crowd truly shares in the fight upon the sand, in a way not dissimilar from that of a congregation assisting in divine service. It was from within the liturgical framework of the Church's worship that the English drama indeed sprang, rather than from the classical theatre. Yet there is a clear similarity between the dialogues of simple classical drama, using a leader and chorus, and the dialogue exchanges during the liturgical services which were the original source of our English drama.

The English drama had its beginnings in church and continued there until the scale of dramatic representations, their increasing popularity, and the objections raised to the portrayal of 'things tending to jesting' in 'the temple of the Lord' forced the actors to move out of the church buildings in search of greater space and more freedom in the source of subjects. Just as the widening horizons of Greek drama had detached it further and further from its religious context, so also in England the introduction of moralities, with profane characters as well as sacred, signalled the growing secularization of the theatre—a process which was virtually complete before the great flowering of English drama under the first Elizabeth. This was the admittedly secular theatre over which the consciences of the new puritans of both Reformation and Counter-Reformation began to be troubled. And who can deny that in many of their fears they were amply justified? For with the eclipse of puritanism at the Restoration of 1660 a licentiousness unknown to previous ages was introduced with the reopening of the playhouses. The divorce of Church and drama was virtually complete for over two and a half centuries.

Some thirty years ago, however, it began to be suspected that perhaps a tragic mistake had been made, that the metaphorical baby had been thrown away with the bath-water; for the drama was the child of religion and the Church. There had clearly been a need to cleanse what had become corrupt, often godless; but in the cleansing, the offspring itself had been cast out. New questions were now asked. Plays were very often pagan, but need they always be so? Actors were often notoriously immoral, but whose fault was that? Could blame not be laid partly at the Church's own door? Was there not something in the theory that man's worship of God is capable of a myriad expressions, and that those artists, writers, and actors who were sincerely concerned to produce things of beauty in their own right were also worshipping the Lord God, though many would be surprised and even affronted to hear it?

Since the 1920s great and exciting progress has been made in healing the breach between Church and drama. The Anglican Church had an advantage in this, for she had been generally less influenced by excesses of puritanism than her Roman Catholic or Free Church brethren. But all Christians have to a

wonderful degree shared the achievements of these memorable years, for which humble thanks are due to Almighty God. Outstanding among the instruments for the pursuit of this great purpose, constantly reminding the Church of its responsibilities and opportunities with respect to drama, has been the Religious Drama Society of Great Britain, founded in 1929 as an interdenominational body, and numbering distinguished Free Churchmen, Roman Catholics, and Anglicans among its Vice-Presidents.

Mention must also be made of the leading part played by poets in the growing consciousness of a common purpose between Church and drama. This is neither the time nor place to discuss the notable revival of poetic drama in England; suffice it to say that this coincided to a remarkable degree with the revival of religious drama, the coincidence being personified in the two best-known writers of religious drama in England, who are also the best known of our dramatic poets, Mr T. S. Eliot and Mr Christopher Fry. Mr Martin Browne, the Chairman of the Religious Drama Society, who has been closely associated with both these writers, has directed all Mr Eliot's plays in their original productions, from *Murder in the Cathedral* at Canterbury in 1935 to the eagerly awaited *The Elder Statesman* to be performed at this year's Edinburgh Festival.

The use which the Church is now making and must increasingly make of the drama, its prodigal child returned, may be broadly divided under two heads, the direct and the indirect. Between them they embrace the Church's entire activity in this field, which is an essential part of the whole problem of Christian communication which is exercising the minds of so many people today.

The direct use of drama is in the Church's presentation, either on its own premises or under its patronage, of plays with a direct Christian message, often evangelistic. There are very few communities these days, whether they be great cities or small villages, which are without some form of amateur dramatic society, and of these a great many are directly sponsored by churches and chapels. Perhaps they produce an annual Passion or Nativity play, coupled with occasional pieces for the general entertainment of the congregation and their friends. The standards attained by such groups vary enormously, but when there is a good leader available, a remarkable quality is often achieved with hard work and sensible recourse to outside aids, such, for example, as the Library of the R.D.S., or the coloured filmstrip recently issued by the Methodist Religious Drama Committee. Groups may well produce their Nativity and Passion plays in church, though a well-equipped hall nearby would be preferable for such a piece as André Obey's *Noah*, which has an appeal outside parochial or congregational limits. Actors taking part in these productions should always be connected with the Church's primary activity of worship, and will most probably be members of the congregation concerned. Their purpose will be a specifically religious one; to present the truths of the faith more clearly to those both inside and outside the Church. The priest or minister, meanwhile, may well have an eye slyly upon the benefits which the members of the cast themselves gain from the process!

Economics of the theatre being what they are, it is seldom possible for the Church to sponsor plays directly upon a scale bigger than that of local or diocesan productions. Although there is no lower limit to the use the Church



might make of drama—three Sunday-school children re-enacting the story of St Paul's conversion are important exponents of religious drama and its principles—a rigid upper limit is placed upon its activities by lack of capital as well as the present dearth of suitable material. Only occasionally can something on a national or international level be done. Sometimes, however, this proves possible, and one example is the presentation by the Religious Drama Society of Fry's *A Sleep of Prisoners* for the Festival of Britain. The play was discussed in circles far outside the Church both in this country and in others, and later productions abroad included one in New York and a highly controversial one by M. Jean-Louis Barrault at the Marigny Theatre in Paris. The international influence of this play is symbolic of the lead which England has given to the whole world in the revival of religious drama. Meanwhile, at home nothing more remarkable has been achieved in the whole field than at Edinburgh, where the Gateway Theatre is sponsored directly by the Scottish Kirk and presents a comprehensive series of plays of which only a proportion are specifically 'religious' in the generally accepted sense of the word.

Important, however, as these direct uses which the Church is making of drama are, there are many who feel that the needs of our time are better met by direct influence upon the commercial theatre, whether in the playhouse, on television or radio, or in the cinema. In times when distortions of Christian standards are being increasingly accepted without question, the Church must ensure that the theatre fulfils the rôle which we stated at the outset, to hold a mirror up to Christian (and therefore universal) truth. If a play can be said to do this, it may then be called a religious play in the widest sense. For God is the Lord of all Truth and the pursuit of that Truth must by definition lead nearer to Him. The Church must therefore be loud in its acclamation of plays and films which are essentially truthful, even though they may not appear to discuss directly 'religious' truths at all. A Christian going, shall we say, to the recent successful revival of the *Lysistrata* of Aristophanes might welcome it with gratitude. It is a play about the desirability of peace and the folly of war, things which vastly outweigh in importance the rather frivolous treatment of sexual behaviour which is the author's vehicle for his message.

Furthermore, should not the Christian always welcome serious investigation by playwrights of serious subjects, though the authors may reveal themselves in the process as not being converted Christians themselves? They are searching for the truth which will set them free; Christians know that Truth, and should have only sympathy and encouragement for those who are seriously searching for the way to it. Here, for instance, is one important example of an issue which has arisen in three plays during the last twelve months. Any Christian who is truthful with himself and tries to understand other people will know the enormous influence which is exercised for good or ill by illusions and illusory ambitions in all our lives. The Christian should have come to terms with these, but he should still recognize the paramount part they play in many lives around him, and should have something vital to say upon the subject whenever it is brought into the light. Three plays have recently done this, yet how many Christians would recognize their debt to the respective playwrights for their serious and sincere treatment of such an influential subject? I am speaking of M. Jean Genet's *The Balcony* (which caused an absurdly mischievous scandal when it

was produced at the Arts Theatre), Mr Robert Bolt's *Flowering Cherry*, and Eugene O'Neill's monumental play, *The Iceman Cometh*. Recognition and healthy criticism of these plays by the Church, and the formation thereby of an educated Christian opinion on them, would have done far, far more for the advancement of Christ's Kingdom on earth than many Church members would recognize.

There is surely an urgent need for Christian opinion to be lively and vocal about these matters, for the rising generation learns its religion and standards of morality not so much from the pulpit or the school desk as from the examples of those around them and the standards of truth which are accepted as gospel by the characters they see on the television screen or at the pictures. Christian opinion today seems particularly liable to concern itself with incidentals, and to ignore the underlying truths to which it above all should be most sensitive. How many Christians have felt they should stay away from Mr Tennessee Williams's *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* because the characters swear and mention unmentionable things? Yet in so doing they have missed a sincere study of human relationships in general and of marital love and fidelity in particular. In this they are encouraged, alas, by the present censorship system in England, which is notoriously bad at distinguishing between what matters and what does not.

In conclusion, one might say there are few more powerful weapons at the Church's disposal in its continuous battle against the forces of darkness than the drama. None possesses its potentiality to uphold and reflect the essential truths of religion and of nature. We may thank God that His Church has become conscious once more during recent years of her prodigal child, and is bringing its talents increasingly into her service. But it is for everyone, clergy and laity alike, to see that the progress is maintained and developed in future years, not only in general and in theory, but in particular churches and chapels, in particular London or local theatres, and with particular actors both amateur and professional, so that to God may be the glory for ever and ever. JOHN HESTER

---



## PAINING AND SCULPTURE

ART AT its greatest is a means of praising God, not merely of expressing the emotions of man. Self-expression, sometimes held to be the only purpose of art, is in fact an incidental by-product. Of course all sincere artists express themselves, but they do not necessarily do so consciously; and, if they would produce a work that is really great, they must fix their eyes upon what is outside themselves. One of the things they must express, for example, is humility; for without it their work will lack that universality of appeal which is a characteristic of great art. But humility is not obedient to command and is not attained by consciously striving for it.

The subject of their work is one of the main things with which they must be concerned. Certain subjects will move some artists more deeply than others. For many centuries European art was concerned with man and his actions, even when the Man was the Son of God. In China, however, from very early times, human beings were incidental to paintings, often, indeed, entirely absent from them; the great topic was the world of Nature—either minute flowers and insects, or the vast panorama of mountains and rivers. In Europe, landscape painting first became important in the seventeenth century, and ever since then the demand for it and the supply of it have increased. The deep feeling inspiring the wonderful paintings of China was undoubtedly religious; and today in Europe it is landscape painting, rather than the illustration of the Christian theme, which most frequently expresses true religious feeling. Nevertheless, however much feeling is expressed and whatever its quality, the artist must clearly give careful attention to his subject.

He must also be concerned about certain qualities in the work itself. One of them is clarity—though this does not mean that every new work of art is easy to understand; for it is as necessary for the spectator to be patient and receptive as it is for the artist to be clear. Closely allied to clarity are consistency, unity and order; for the parts of a work of art must belong together as truly as the leaves, branches and trunk of a tree.

The artist must also take account of the materials with which he works. The pigment used by the painter and the stone carved by the sculptor play their part in his inventions. These materials must be so used that they unite perfectly with the image to be conveyed; for only then does the artist produce that sense of rightness which is an essential element in the mysterious abstraction called 'beauty', which is one of the greatest of the soul's spiritual needs.

It is clear that many things besides self-expression go to the creation of a work of art, and that the artist is concerned all the time with things which are outside himself. Indeed, perhaps the word should not be creation but invention, which properly means finding or discovery; for it is God's creations which supply both the world of appearance from which the artist selects his imagery and the material by means of which it is re-created.

Christianity has not always encouraged the representative arts. In the eighth century the Eastern Church was divided into those who decreed that religious painting and sculpture should rigidly imitate ancient models, and those who banned both arts as idolatrous. The ban was revived by the sixteenth-century Puritans.

Distrust of beauty seldom leads to increased goodness. Yet high standards of faith and morals have not always produced great art. During the first three centuries of our era, when Christianity was spreading, the Roman catacombs were being adorned with interesting but timid imitations of the decaying realistic Pompeian tradition.

In the following centuries many church walls were decorated by mosaics, first in the Roman tradition of inserting opaque stones in the walls, and then in the Byzantine technique of using cubes of glass, gilded or coloured.

Two mosaics of *The Good Shepherd* at Ravenna show the contrasted methods. In the fifth-century Mausoleum of Galla Placidia, Christ is of the beardless Apollo type and is surrounded by a few sheep solidly related to the ground. On the apse of the large sixth-century Church of St Apollinare in Classe a tall, bearded Christ stands flatly between symmetrical groups of sheep, symbolizing the Apostles. The unsubstantial design of harmonious greens and golds has the reality of a mystical vision.

This type of mosaic, in which saints glitter splendidly in the gloom, continued to decorate Italian churches for many centuries. Occasionally in Rome painting echoed the other older indigenous tradition of monumentality; striking examples are the thirteenth-century frescoes of *Christ in Judgement*, by Pietro Cavallini (St Cecilia) and those by Cavallini's presumed pupil, Giotto at Padua. Giotto's masterpieces, however, owe even more to his direct observation of human behaviour, seen at its worst in the faces of the tormentors of Christ in *The Mockery* and at its best in those of the expectant mothers in *The Visitation*.

This intimate spirit, quite unlike the hierarchic atmosphere of most previous Christian art, is largely due to the revolution brought about by St Francis's teaching. Pictures of the Christ-child embracing His Mother were far more frequent after this revolution than before it. Two fine thirteenth-century English renderings are the exquisite if quite unrealistic wall painting *The Chichester Roundel* (Bishop's Palace, Chichester) and the pen-and-wash drawing (British Museum) in Matthew Paris's illuminated *Historia Anglorum*.

The circulation of illuminated manuscripts helped to spread pictorial styles and ideas. They contributed to the late fourteenth-century style known as 'International Gothic', in which realism in detail and semi-abstract linear rhythm are combined with a naïve belief in the Garden of Paradise, as in *The Wilton Diptych* (National Gallery).

Soon after this the learning of the Renaissance encouraged a fuller realism in Florentine art. Masaccio painted the *Madonna and Child* (National Gallery), in which a very human baby eats bitter grapes and His Mother (in a painting which, though now at Naples, used to be above our panel) foresees the Crucifixion; here the broad-shouldered Christ on the cross recalls Donatello's noble wooden figure of the Saviour (St Croce, Florence) of which Brunelleschi said: 'You have crucified a peasant.'

After Masaccio many Italians produced masterpieces of religious art. Botticelli alternated between Pagan and Christian themes, in which desire for ideal beauty is hardly distinguishable from 'hunger and thirst after righteousness'. Giovanni Bellini specialized in finding a landscape setting appropriate to his subject, as in the threatening sunrise of the *Agony in the Garden* (National Gallery), the still grey skies of the poignantly tragic *Pietà* (Brera, Milan), and

the serene pastureland of the *Madonna of the Meadow* (National Gallery).

With a few exceptions, such as Michelangelo's works and Leonardo's *Last Supper* (Milan), the painters of the High Renaissance, greatly as they advanced in technique and composition, made little corresponding advance in religious feeling; but by the middle of the century the Counter-Reformation had caused a return to a more devotional outlook, seen at its best in Tintoretto's numerous, enormous, and seemingly improvised paintings in the Scuola di San Rocco, Venice. In these he illustrates even well-worn subjects with an entirely fresh eye, as in the *Nativity* which takes place in the cramped discomfort of a stable loft.

El Greco's inspired painting owed something to Tintoretto's chiaroscuro and the teaching of Titian, something to his fervently Catholic Spanish patrons, and most to the symbolic Byzantine tradition prevailing in his native Crete. His *Funeral of Count Orgaz* (San Tomé, Toledo) combines in one vision a series of realistic portraits and an equally circumstantial rendering of Heaven. In his *Resurrection* (Prado, Madrid) the nude, elongated figures below Christ, nominally soldiers, seem symbols of aspiring souls.

Like El Greco, the greatest of the Italians combined beauty of style with spirituality of inspiration. The religious painting of the Netherlands, though often equally inspired, was sometimes lacking in outward grace; but the naïvely unbeautiful faces and awkward figures of the fifteenth-century *Nativity* (National Gallery) by Geertgen of Haarlem in no way detracts from the picture's charm, which depends upon deep sincerity and a searching study, anticipating Rembrandt, of effects of light. The main light in this little picture proceeds from the Child.

Light is a natural symbol of goodness and happiness. The earliest *Nativity* in which the Child is the source of light is the Gothic panel, imaginative and quite unrealistic by Meister Francke of Hamburg. The most sophisticated rendering is the famous *La Notte* by Correggio at Dresden, in which all the other figures receive light from the Child, who Himself receives it from a near source, invisible and unexplained.

In Rembrandt's *Nativity* (National Gallery) the source of light, though as near to the Child as possible, comes from a lantern hidden behind the first shepherd. Here, as in all Rembrandt's paintings, each of the *dramatis personae*—the simple shepherds of different ages, the worshipping woman bringing a child of her own, the retiring old woman at the back, the boy dragging along a reluctant dog—is conceived with that loving insight which is one reason why Rembrandt is immeasurably the greatest of Protestant religious artists.

His French contemporary, Georges de la Tour, who infused a comparable tenderness into his austere designs, painted two pictures of the *Nativity* (Rennes and the Louvre) in which the light comes from a candle partly hidden by the hand of a worshipper.

Since the seventeenth century, paintings of religious subjects have seldom reached the highest standard. The best, with a few exceptions, such as the almost wholly tragic work of Rouault, have lacked the wide appeal of the masterpieces of the past. Stanley Spencer's *Journey to Calvary* (Tate Gallery), though unlikely to satisfy many (at least outside England), has, however, great beauty of colour, and sincerely conveys a visionary experience of figures dimly discerned

in the clearly seen setting of a street of Cookham, the painter's native village.

Sculpture, quite as much as painting, has been inspired by Christian themes. Examples have been almost as varied as in painting, and the standard of excellence quite as high—sometimes higher. In some respects the sculptor, so long as he avoids naturalistic colour (which leads to cheap illusion), is more restricted than the painter. Most stone yields to the carver's chisel with difficulty; and this fact encourages consistency. Moreover, in medieval times, when the Church was virtually the only patron of art, although frescoes and altarpieces were conceived in relation to their architectural setting, the building exercised even greater control over the statues and reliefs adorning it.

Thus the twelfth-century statues of the west portals of Chartres Cathedral have the function of columns, and the long cylinders within which they are confined contribute to their regal dignity; while the relief of *Christ in Glory* is derived almost as much from the arched tympanum which it fills as from the conception of the divine theme.

On the north porch of Chartres (a thirteenth-century structure) the upright figures are freer in pose, more graceful and less grandly architectural; but the group of the *Visitation*, in which Mary and Elizabeth emerge slightly from rigid verticality, is a masterpiece of restrained tenderness.

Most medieval sculptors by instinct, and many modern sculptors on principle, have emphasized to the utmost the material in which they work. A beautiful example is the sixteenth-century German statue in wood of *Christ riding an Ass* (Victoria and Albert Museum).

The aim of others has been the opposite—to persuade stone to look as unlike stone and as much like flesh, hair or garments as possible. The greatest genius who pursued this second aim was the baroque sculptor, Bernini. His most brilliant achievement was the *Ecstasy of St Theresa* (S Maria della Vittoria, Rome) in which are represented rays of light, fluttering garments, and figures miraculously poised, expressing the paradox of intense agony and intense joy combined.

The first Christian sculptor who put expressiveness before obedience to material was Claus Sluter, the Flemish Burgundian, who completed the *Well of Moses* (Chartreuse, Dijon) in about 1400; all the prophets supporting this fountain are severely intellectual and ascetic, but these qualities are most marked in the Moses, whose statue anticipates much of the awe-inspiring aspect of Michelangelo's Moses in Rome. The Israelites might well have trembled before the wrath of both.

Michelangelo, however, loved the marble out of which he created his sculptures. Significantly, he never worked in bronze. His mood, too, was invariably tragic. He carved three splendid groups illustrating Christ's end—one (at St Peter's) at the beginning and two (Florence Cathedral and Brera, Milan) at the end of his own life. The one at St Peter's, consists of an elaborately detailed rendering of the Mother supporting Her Son; in the Brera group, which was never finished, the mourners and the Saviour have hardly emerged from the marble block.

Casting statues or reliefs in bronze lends itself to greater freedom and naturalism than carving them in stone. The carver subtracts, releasing his creation from its prison. The bronze caster adds clay to clay, from which, when complete,

he makes the mould; into this he pours the liquid metal, which, when cooled and solidified, becomes the final figure.

Unlike Michelangelo, Donatello worked in both bronze and stone, and with equal success. Rodin, who might almost be called a nineteenth-century Donatello, treated bronze more expressively than marble, which he did not carve with his own hand. Two of Rodin's most powerful bronzes are of the *Prodigal Son* and of *St John the Baptist*. The young Prodigal's body is thrown backwards in a pose of such violent repentance as to defy the canons of architectural stability. The gaunt St John, more akin in spirit than in form to Donatello's fine marble statues of the Baptist, is as tense in mood as the Prodigal, but more formally controlled. Rodin's statue looked most impressive when it stood on a mound among the trees of Battersea Park; the saint seemed truly to be calling the on-lookers to repentance.

In twentieth-century England Christian sculpture has reached a higher level than Christian painting. In Eric Gill's reliefs of the *Stations of the Cross* (Westminster Cathedral) deep feeling has been nobly expressed in the severe conventions of the Romanesque tradition. Sir Jacob Epstein, powerful as are his carvings in stone, is at his most inspired when his bronze casts reproduce the rough texture of his clay models, as in two statues by him of the *Madonna and Child*: the *Indian Madonna* (in which the Child is somewhat older), and the fine group on the gate of the Convent in Cavendish Square. In both the Mother appears cryptic and prophetic; and the Child, devoid of superficial grace, looks forth with eyes that gaze not on present surroundings but on a future of self-surrender.

Nothing could be more different from Epstein's Madonnas than Henry Moore's stone group of the same subject at St Matthew's, Northampton. Epstein, a master of portraiture, has represented idealized individuals. Moore, though conceding more to naturalism than is usual to him, has created a noble, monumental and perfectly harmonized, but not specifically Christian, tribute to whatever is divine in the universal relationship between any mother and any child.

CHARLES W. H. JOHNSON

---



## CHRISTIANITY AND ARCHITECTURE

THROUGHOUT THE ages the Christian Church has been responsible for some of the finest buildings in every century. In all countries the churches and cathedrals built in the last 1,900 years have represented the highest tradition of design and craftsmanship, and this tradition is the background against which the future of church building must be considered. In the past the Church has been the centre of the arts; architecture, sculpture, painting, music and drama, have all found their inspiration in the life and work of the Church, because of the fact that the Church has been in many instances the true centre of the community. The result of this combination of artistic endeavour has been the magnificent cathedrals of all European countries and the beautiful village churches. Today, although the principles and traditions of the Christian Church have changed little, the Church both as a building and a society has ceased to occupy a central position in the life of the nation and the buildings erected for worship have tended to become less important than the civic buildings and utilitarian buildings of our time, which are more prominent in our cities.

In the same way the Church is no longer the major patron of the arts. This rôle has now passed to the State and in some cases to private individuals. With the development of the contemporary way of life has arisen a contemporary architecture which is providing fine modern buildings for schools, public buildings, housing, and civic buildings, but the Church has failed to keep up with these developments in the architectural sphere and today appears to be content in most cases with second-rate buildings which have no architectural merit and are often crude in design, inconvenient in use, and lacking in inspiration. This state of affairs is nothing short of a tragedy, for the great church buildings of the past have always been the most modern of their time and have set the pace for others to follow. Indeed, buildings like King's College Chapel in Cambridge, Beauvais Cathedral, and many others are daring structures built with immense courage and skill, standing today as examples of inspired architecture which were at the time of building in advance of the secular architecture of the period.

In the twentieth century we seem to be content with mean brick structures with a vague hint of Gothic detail, little character, and no enthusiasm. The twentieth century has been a period of material and scientific progress and discovery; but the new ways of thought which have emerged do not invalidate the ageless message of Christianity, they merely emphasize the need for new methods in presenting it to the world. Architecture can play its part in this presentation, for new methods need new buildings. Modern architecture, can give us a great many things which can be to our advantage—large spans, light and elegant structures, new and beautiful materials, new ways of using traditional materials, mechanical equipment, and efficient services. These should be put to the service of the Church, which has never in the past failed to employ the best human talent of every age to the greater glory of God.

Contemporary forms have proved themselves capable of the gaiety and lightness seen in the new buildings which are rising around us; the challenge of the Church to modern architects, and one which must be accepted, is that of

expressing in these new materials and techniques the eternal nature of the spiritual truths of the Christian faith.

While it is true that through the passing centuries the basis of the Christian faith has remained the same, the background into which it fits has inevitably changed, and no longer is the cathedral, designed as a place of mystery to impress and encourage the illiterate, a logical expression of contemporary Christianity. When the cathedrals were built, with their vast stained-glass windows and ornate and extravagant carving, they were designed as a living picture book which told the story of Christianity in the stained glass, the carving, tapestry, and ornaments. Today, all who attend for worship in the modern church can read for themselves and no longer need the picture-book story of the stained-glass window or the three-dimensional representation in the carvings. There have been other changes too. For example, the Church no longer provides the welfare, educational, and medical facilities that were its prerogative in the Middle Ages; these functions have rightly been taken over by the State.

The function of the Church as a centre of fellowship, however, still remains, and the new buildings for present-day use must take this into account and be designed accordingly. Most certainly they should not be designed for use on one day a week only. The church must once more become the centre of the community in which it stands, providing a focal point or community centre in the true sense of the term. Some of the most successful modern experiments in Christian development have been in the new towns and large housing estates, where the church has provided that essential focal point without which no community can survive. It is therefore obvious that new churches should provide a centre not only for worship, but for many other activities in which men and women can meet together and share their experiences and together seek a common solution to the problems of our civilization.

If such buildings are to form a focal point of a community, they must be of architectural value to that community, not as mock Classic or pseudo-Gothic monuments, but as examples of contemporary design, of which there are as yet far too few among English church buildings. Semi-permanent structures of a nondescript character often have to suffice as the religious centre of a new community for far too long. If the Church is to meet the challenge of the new urban areas and attract the people who work in modern factories, whose children attend modern schools, and who live in modern houses, they must at least start their work with buildings which are as good as, if not better than, the secular ones around. The fundamental issue before modern civilization concerns the part which the spiritual interpretation of life will continue to play in the world, and if the Church is associated in the mind of the non-church-going public with outdated and irrelevant buildings, then the task of inspiring their confidence and persuading them that the message of Christianity is relevant today is made more difficult.

It must be admitted that finance is a problem which faces all the Churches and that the difficulty of raising money for new building projects is increasing, but this emphasizes the need for greater care in the use of the money that is available. Good design need not be expensive or elaborate. Economic conditions make plainer and simpler buildings a necessity. Useless ornament, ugly and untidy decoration, meaningless symbols should all be things of the past in



all forms of building, but particularly in church building. Out of this new simplicity we must strive to find new beauty. Looking back on the history of the Church, we can see that some of its buildings which we now consider to be the most ugly, particularly those of the Victorian era, were in fact the most expensive. J. B. Lehrman, in his 1953 prize-winning Architectural Association essay, 'Religious Expression and Contemporary Architecture', suggests that

Perhaps the ideal synthesis between religious buildings and the modern movement will be resolved through simplicity. Before God, man is at his simplest, and for this reason alone it could be argued that the contemporary idiom would seem to be the most natural in the world in ecclesiastical design. Indeed, the few contemporary religious buildings that have been universally acknowledged as masterpieces have this one essential factor of simplicity in common.

This trend towards simple, carefully-designed contemporary buildings using modern building techniques and materials has already produced fine churches, particularly in Switzerland and in the Scandinavian countries. Admittedly these countries did not have the equivalent of our Victorian era to contend with, and contemporary architecture has been an obvious and natural development of traditional building, but these new churches for both Catholic and Protestant denominations are a fine testimony to the possibilities of contemporary design as a solution to the problem of the modern church. Unfortunately, there are few comparable examples in Great Britain, where Church authorities appear to be afraid of contemporary design and in many cases, although giving lip-service to it in their official publications, oppose it vigorously when actual projects are considered.

It is of interest to note that in many of the outstanding modern churches on the Continent contemporary artists and sculptors have been commissioned to produce works for the buildings, whereas if a painting or sculpture is considered at all for English churches, it is often regarded as a matter of secondary importance, and inferior work is often used.

It is most important that every part of the design of contemporary buildings should be in sympathy; and in a church, where so many different factors have importance, this question of the relationship of building with furnishing and decoration is particularly vital. Mass-produced ecclesiastical furniture chosen from a catalogue is seldom satisfactory, and generally of a low standard of design. There is every reason why craftsmen should be employed to make well-designed furnishings and furniture for our new churches, using both new and traditional materials. This applies also to stained glass, which is generally of a very low standard artistically. The new Coventry Cathedral will contain a wealth of specially-designed furnishings and a great deal of work by eminent contemporary artists, and should provide an excellent example of collaboration between contemporary architect, artist, and craftsman. The stained-glass windows, the great tapestry behind the altar, and the individual pieces of sculpture are all being designed by contemporary artists of international repute, such as Henry Moore, Jacob Epstein, and Graham Sutherland. There is no reason why the use of artists should not be extended to smaller buildings than Coventry Cathedral, and young painters and sculptors would welcome the opportunity of collaborating in the enrichment of both old and new churches.

It should be remembered, however, that they must not be expected to produce copies of past artistic styles, but must be given the opportunity of working in their own manner and producing works of art which belong to our day and generation, just as artists and craftsmen of the Middle Ages and other periods produced work which was relevant to their own time.

The history of the last fifty years indicates the chaos that results when the world turns its back on Christian ideals. Scientific discovery and development have outpaced spiritual growth, and man is no longer able to control his own inventions. Our civilization is indeed at the cross-roads; as Dean Inge said: 'It remains to be seen if civilization is to be mended or must be ended: the times seem ripe for a new birth of religious and spiritual life which may remould society, as no less potent force would have the strength to do.' Recent events have shown that through the advance of nuclear science the total destruction of the human race is within the realms of possibility, yet we know that the very forces of destruction could also be harnessed to make life fuller and happier for all mankind.

This is the challenge that faces the Christian Church today; for, apart from the message of the Church, the future, if there is to be a future, seems dark. Science, education, and humanitarian ideals by themselves have all failed to provide a solution to world problems and have proved that they need to be inspired by a faith greater than themselves. The faith that is needed is that which is held by Christians of all denominations: that the fatherhood of God is the greatest reality in the world, and that through His Son men may share the blessing of that fatherhood and live together as brothers.

The buildings of the Church can play their part in meeting the challenge that faces the Christian Church today, and contemporary architecture can provide one means of linking the Church and its ideals with the modern way of life. The design of churches has always been difficult—perhaps never so difficult as at the present time. The architect of today must fully understand the true meaning of the traditions of the Christian Church and with a thoughtful inventiveness design all the elements of its buildings in a sensitive and contemporary manner.

EDWARD D. MILLS

---

## MUSIC IN CHRISTIAN LITURGY

THE PUBLIC worship of the Christian Church is of two kinds; each is necessary, each is good; and each is served by its appropriate music.

Worship in the parish church (or in the Nonconformist one) is concerted worship—family prayer, in which the congregation audibly takes part. Worship in the cathedral is delegated worship—the prayer offered by a religious community on behalf of the whole Christian society, prayer at which the presence of a congregation is not essential, and in which the congregation (if there be one) takes no audible part.

In a parish church the offering of public worship is for the most part, in the true meaning of the word, amateur; it is done for love; and the style of this worship will be such as the ability of amateurs can afford. In a cathedral the offering of public worship is for the most part professional; and the style of this worship will be the best that professional skill can contrive.

The cathedral church is in religion what the university is in education. A decline in the vitality of either institution will mean first a lowering of the aim, and then in consequence a lowering also of achievement. The cathedral is in its very nature an aristocratic conception; it is the sphere in which the best is to prevail. The style of worship offered in the cathedral is not to be governed by an appeal to popular likes and dislikes; the appeal will be to men of educated and informed taste, trained to discriminate between the better and the worse.

This is not to say that worship in the parish church may admit what is second-rate or shoddy; only that it will use a simpler music than is used in the cathedral, music moreover that is not remote from the experience of the worshipper.

The cathedral, the physical structure with its plenishings, is already an act of praise; it is a doxology. Its architecture is not useful but expressive. In even a small cathedral there is room to seat two or three thousand people, but the size of the building is not determined by any consideration of that kind. There are more convenient ways, and cheaper ways, of erecting four walls and a roof to protect a large concourse of people from the weather. The cathedral is built on the grand scale in order that it may both express and suggest to the beholder the divine majesty. The feeling of awe, almost of dread, is the fundamental religious impulse; and nothing so quickly serves to awaken this feeling as vast spaces, adroitly defined by walls and pillars. There is a good deal of space on Hampstead Heath; but it is not awe-ful, it is not mysterious, like the space under the dome of St Paul's. To create this sense of space, the skill of the architect must be invoked; and if he is to succeed in this particular, he must work on the grand scale. Sheer size is therefore an essential element in the idea of a cathedral, whose function is pre-eminently to express and to suggest the divine majesty.

It is hardly possible to think of worship in the cathedral apart from the music which is the principal means of its realization. There are two reasons why music should be used. I believe it was Henry Purcell who said that music is the exaltation of poetry; and song is the natural means of expressing any mood intensely felt, whether of joy or grief. Inevitably therefore music is pressed into the service of religion, which is dealing with human experience at its most profound and most exalted levels. But there is another reason for the use of

music—a physical reason, grounded in the behaviour of sound. To create the sense of religious awe (we said) the architect of the cathedral uses large spaces, defined by walls and pillars of stone. Stone surfaces reflect the sound impinging upon them, and set up echoes; the building, in virtue of its size and of the material of which it is constructed, is very resonant. The speaking voice, in order to carry the length of the building, must be loud; and in order not to set up conflicting echoes, its range of inflexion must be narrow. You will easily find by experiment that if you read a passage of prose aloud in a large resonant building, your voice tends to settle to an unvaried monotone, only broken by a slight fall in pitch at the ends of clauses or sentences. This kind of utterance, refined by a feeling for style and by the growth of musical sensibility, becomes the simple plainsong inflexion such as is used in singing versicles and responses. The speaking voice becomes the singing voice, reading gives way to incantation; and this happens as the solution to the physical problem set by the building in which worship is offered. Incantation is more formal than speech, more remote, more impersonal, and therefore more fitted to be the vehicle of worship; but also it is much less fatiguing to the voice, and much more agreeable to the ear. There is good sense behind the rubric at Matins in the first English *Book of Common Prayer*:

To the end the people may the better hear, in such places where they do sing, there shall the lessons be sung in a plain tune after the manner of distinct reading; and likewise the Epistle and Gospel.

Music, in short, is the mode of utterance which is natural and appropriate in the cathedral. There have been pulpits in the cathedrals of England since the sixteenth century, from which sermons have been preached. But in a cathedral a sermon, even if the preacher's delivery be good, is (I think) nearly always difficult to listen to; it is at odds with the genius of the building.

In the cathedrals and choral foundations of the Church of England the music used in public worship is entrusted to a precentor (assisted by other singing priests), an organist, and a professional choir. A normal establishment consists of twenty-eight or thirty singers—about twelve men and sixteen boys. It is a small company, welded by the daily performance of divine service into a skilful team; and the music which it makes is a kind of chamber music, intimate and sensitive. Only a small band of singers is needed, because the very resonance which impedes the speaking voice has been wonderfully exploited by the composers, who have written music which largely depends for its charm and beauty on the prolonging of musical sound by the echoes of the building. This is the 'linked sweetness long drawn out' which so moved John Milton, and dissolved him into ecstasies. The music may truly be described as scored for voices and architecture; the architecture is part of the instrument. (For this reason, cathedral music performed in a broadcasting studio or in a concert hall fails of half its effect; and for the same reason, while it may be useful to relay the spoken voice from one part of a cathedral to another, it is ruinous to relay music; its charm at once evaporates.)

It is for these or similar conditions that the great liturgical music was written, in England and on the Continent, by the composers of the golden age of polyphony. Byrd in England, Lassus in the Netherlands, Palestrina in Italy,

Vittoria in Spain, all composed for small professional choirs singing in large and resonant buildings; they were concerned that their music should be (as Byrd put it) 'framed to the life of the words'; that it should, as perfectly as they knew how, express the mysteries of the Faith. They were not concerned that their music should be popular, or agreeable to the congregation; for there was no congregation to consider.

Once the composer begins to consider the pleasure of a congregation, there is the risk that he will write not so much liturgical music as music for a sacred concert. Purcell, the organist of Westminster Abbey, touches the heights in his *Remember not, Lord, our offences* for five voices, his *Hear my prayer* for eight voices, and the little funeral anthem for Queen Mary, *Thou knowest, Lord, the secrets of our hearts*, which was sung, not long after he had written it, at his own funeral. All these are masterpieces of liturgical music; in all of them Purcell is serving, not the ears of a congregation, but the liturgy itself. On the other hand, Purcell, the organist of the Chapel Royal, composing music in the new style for the delectation of Charles II, the 'brisk and airy Prince' who ordered him to 'add symphonies, etc., with instruments' to his anthems, writes nothing of comparable worth.

Great liturgical music seems then to require (apart from great composers) two conditions: first, that there shall be professional choirs technically competent to perform it; secondly, that the composer shall be free to serve the liturgy itself, without considering whether his music is agreeable or intelligible to a congregation. It is to the cathedrals and their choirs that we must look today for the performance of liturgical music of the first rank by living composers. We have the cathedrals, here and on the Continent; we have in England choirs equal to the most exacting music. We have some music of the first rank by living composers—the Mass in G minor of Vaughan Williams, the glorious and splendid Mass of Stravinsky, the two Masses of Edmund Rubbra (one composed for Canterbury Cathedral, the other for Westminster Cathedral). We need much more music of this calibre. Perhaps it will not be forthcoming until it is asked for.

The liturgy offered in the cathedral may be served by music that is remote from the musical experience of the wayfaring Christian—remote because it is as old as Machaut or as new as Stravinsky. In the parish church or chapel the case is otherwise; here the liturgy is the offering of a congregation neither skilled in the performance of music, nor versed in the understanding of music composed before 1600 or after 1900. The music used here must be of a kind that the congregation can make its own, can appropriate as the vehicle of its own audible prayer and praise. Any good hymn-tune, for example, from the OLD 100TH (which is 400 years old) to DOWN AMPNEY (which is forty or thereabouts) will be welcome among congregations of all denominations; but VEXILLA REGIS (which is three times as old as the OLD 100TH) though it be passionately loved by a few will be alien to the taste of the majority.

JOSEPH W. POOLE



## GOTTLOB MÜLLER: IN MEMORIAM

(The founder of Wesleyan Methodism in Germany, who died on 17th March 1858)

IN THE *Missionary Notices*, January 1831, we read the following short note:

Domestic Intelligence. Very gratifying intelligence has been recently received from various parts of the continent of Europe; many individuals in Prussia and Germany have been awakened and converted through the instrumentality of some pious visitants from this country, members of the Methodist society. Very pressing applications have, in consequence, been made for Missionaries to watch over the small societies which have been formed, and to superintend the progress of the work. To one of these applications from 'Winenden' (Winnenden) in the Kingdom of Württemberg, the Committee are inclined to accede; and they would be glad to enter into correspondence with any Itinerant or Local Preacher whose acquaintance with the German language would enable him to enter immediately on the ministerial instruction and pastoral care, of a people, who, we hope, are prepared of the Lord.

No reply was received from any English Methodist minister, and therefore the Missionary Society agreed to ask a Mr Müller to go to Germany. This Mr Müller was a native of Germany who had left his fatherland when a young man, because he did not wish to fight with Napoleon's troops against the Russians. Thus he came as a German butcher to London. Here in London he found Christ in a Methodist church and became an Exhorter and Class-Leader in the Great Queenstreet Circuit. He was one of the above-mentioned 'pious visitants', who travelled several times to Winnenden, and he preached there in his father's house where Moravian meetings were held. It was not easy for Müller to accede to the Missionary Society's request. He was now about 46 years old, he had a young family, and his father-in-law threatened to disinherit him if he went to Germany. In addition, Müller questioned his own ability for the task: would he be able to do such missionary work in the country of the Protestant Reformation—he, who was just a simple layman, without any ministerial training? But when he read the letters which reached him from Winnenden and when he remembered the sinful people to whom he had preached the gospel of Salvation, the simple exhorter heard in his conscience the call of God and said: 'Here I am, send me!' One of the letters from Winnenden is of particular interest. It is from a Mr Strubel and is dated 4th November 1830:

I must tell you with joy that our new society has increased greatly so that we have been obliged to divide the classes. I hold a class in my own house consisting of twenty-five members among whom are those that were blessed with pardoning grace while you were here. Mr Reisch has also a class in his own house. On Sunday morning at 7 o'clock in one of your Father's rooms the whole society meet together in a prayer-meeting. . . . We wish you would come, for it will not increase as it might, since I can say very little, being but young in the way. I am now writing to the Mission House to send you as a Missionary to us, and if it should be the will of the Almighty God, make haste and come that nothing may be neglected. . . .

Müller left London on 28th February 1831 and arrived at Winnenden on the 12th of March. Thus, as so often in the history of Methodism, the work began in Germany through the service of a lay-missionary wholly dedicated to his Lord.

We obtain the best insight into the development of Wesleyan Methodism in Germany by studying the letters and reports which Müller wrote from Winnenden to the Missionary Society in London.<sup>1</sup> From them we learn of the message Müller preached, the relationship between Methodism and the State-Church, and the growth of the Methodist movement.

If we ask ourselves how it was possible that a layman could start such a movement in Protestant Germany, we must first look at his message. It was the biblical message of personal and present forgiveness of sins and the witness of the Spirit. And this simple message, at that time of rationalism and liberalism, was an entirely new one for the ears of the people. Because of it, some of the curates preached against Müller and some of the old Pietists were also offended. Müller writes in a letter:

They complain of this short way. They say, they have been seeking it for 30 and 40 years and have it not yet, and Sir, I am at a loss to know when they will have it, to be of any use to them. The Universalists are also warning their people. But the more earth and hell oppose the more the work spreads and the souls are growing in Depth of Piety (20th April 1830).

But message and messenger always belong together, and the following quotation illustrates the kind of man Müller was:

Am much obliged for your kind counsel and indeed I find it very salutary, my situation does call for great prudence and perseverance. When I consider the deep rooted prejudice to contend with and the opposition on all sides, added to the weakness of the subject who has to contend, I am almost overwhelmed, but feel *I am engaged for my great master* the great head of the Church (28th May 1832).

Müller never regarded it as his task to bring Methodism to Württemberg, but only to preach Christ as he knew Him—the merciful Lord who gives forgiveness of sins and the witness of His Spirit to all men who believe in Him, here and now.

Wesleyan Methodism was for nearly fifty years a pious society within the Lutheran State-Church of Württemberg. Müller always explained that he did not come to separate the people from the Church. The Methodist people were among its most pious and regular attenders, there were no meetings during the time of its services, and sometimes Methodist class-meetings were attended by pietistic vicars themselves. But the difficulties with the Church began, as we have seen, as a result of the Methodist message of full salvation and also as a result of the Methodist 'Rules'. The State-Church forbade the distribution of class-tickets, because they saw in this practice the beginning of a separation from the Church and the constitution of a distinct organization. So Müller and his helpers were several times summoned before the courts for distributing class-tickets and for preaching without permission of the incumbents (there was an old law of the year 1743 called 'Pietists-law' which allowed no religious meetings without the consent of the local incumbent). But in such cases their word was: 'We must obey God rather than men.' The Methodist prayer-meetings were also a cause of friction. Up to this time it had not been customary



for women to pray freely and openly, but now they did so in the Methodist meetings and aroused the hostility of many of the incumbents. (It is very interesting to see all over the world the great contribution which Methodism has made towards the religious emancipation of women.) Nor must we forget the Methodist struggle against Sunday work and drunkenness. At this time it was quite common in Germany to buy and to sell before and after the service on Sundays. But nobody could now become a member of a Methodist class who did so. And so Methodism all over the country aroused the Church to a stronger activity and a deeper religious life.

Müller's work in Württemberg was from the beginning a real evangelistic movement. We read in his journal (1830):

March 22nd: I went to the village of Steinach, gave an exhortation to a weeping crowd of people. When they have previous notice both young and old come from the surrounding villages. Your heart would rejoice to see how attentive they are, and they drink in the word as the thirsty land the water, while their tears trickle down their faces. O, how easy it is to speak the great word, when the Spirit is clothing it with power. . . . March 25th: I went to Breiningsweiler. Gave an exhortation on the necessity of repentance and holiness. Floods of tears as usual. Squeezing my hands with 'When will you come again?' But I am obliged to tell them it cannot be at least for some weeks.—Sunday 27th: Have not time to eat or to drink for five minutes. The people often send me good tidings and sometimes they come and tell me with joy they have found salvation.—April 3rd: Gave an exhortation at 5 o'clock in the morning in a field, turned it into a prayer-meeting. At 7 o'clock had a prayer-meeting at home, 8 o'clock I met a class—and so it is generally on a Sabbath till 9 or 10 o'clock at night. This evening 9 souls found salvation.—11th: Preached to an attentive congregation at Hertmansweiler from 'Peace be unto you'. My situation is something like John Nelson's. I have a great deal to do with the Moravians. Truly it is a poor sinnership, a big living-in-sin. I know I must go forward through these difficulties. The kingdom of God is coming with power. Old and young are convinced and almost every day some are converted.

Now, why is it that Methodism did not become a stronger Church than we find it today, when its early development was so blessed of God? There are, I believe, three reasons: first, Methodism did not intend to become a Church in Germany and therefore for about thirty years it had only a very weak organization; second, Müller preached all his life only in villages or small country-towns (as opposed to the American Methodists who began their work in Germany about twenty years later, in 1849, and laboured especially in the big towns); and third, Müller did not get any further help in his work. Several times he asked for a trained minister, but the cautious Missionary Society in London could not agree to send one because they wished to avoid further troubles with the Lutheran Church.<sup>2</sup> They were not, however, successful in this, for under the zealous leadership of the Revd J. C. Barratt, Wesleyan Methodism in Württemberg finally separated from the State-Church, after a period of suppression, in the year 1873.

On 17th March 1858 Gottlob Müller died. The Methodist returns for that year were: regular preaching places, 57; places where services were sometimes held, 25; leaders and speakers, 34; members in the Society, 1,040. In a letter written by his son-in-law, who was a Lutheran minister, we read the following:

'His funeral was attended by many of the members of his congregations, who showed great sympathy and gave vent to their sorrow by the expression: We have lost our spiritual father.' But the finest words of memory we find in the *History of the W. M. M. S.* (p.463):

For 25 years he had been the spiritual guide of those who had through him entered into the life of faith in Christ. In fidelity, in diligence, and in spiritual influence the Church had never found a better servant. Alone, unaided, owing nothing to ministerial position, a simple layman wholly devoted to Christ, he had gathered around him a large Company of 'Children in the Gospel', and at the time of his death there were more than 1,000 members of the Church to which he ministered. It is to be questioned whether in all the annals of the Wesleyan Church there is any name more worthy of the honour and reverence of the Church.

The life of this man should move us to thank the Lord of all He has done through His servants, and especially through the work of the Methodist lay-preachers.

LUDWIG ROTT

<sup>1</sup> About eighty of these letters are in the archives of the Methodist Missionary Society.

<sup>2</sup> It was not until 1859, a year after Müller's death, that they sent to Germany the first Wesleyan minister, Dr J. Lyth.

---

## KARL BARTH'S DOCTRINE OF GOD

KARL BARTH'S monumental work on Church Dogmatics is gradually being made available for English readers. The first half of Volume I, *The Doctrine of the Word of God*, appeared in 1935, the second in 1956. The first half of Volume IV, *The Doctrine of Reconciliation*, appeared in 1957; and we are now presented with the first half of Volume II, *The Doctrine of God*,<sup>1</sup> a massive book of some 700 pages, containing Chapters V and VI of the complete work, the Knowledge of God and the Reality of God; and some idea of their scope and their treatment will be gained from the section headings. In Chapter V these are the Fulfilment of the Knowledge of God (Man before God, God before Man), the Knowability of God (the Readiness of God, the Readiness of man), and the Limits of the Knowledge of God (the Hiddenness of God, the Veracity of Man's Knowledge of God). Chapter VI contains the Being of God as the One Who loves in Freedom (the Being of God in Act, the Being of God as the One Who loves, the Being of God in Freedom), the Perfections of God, the Perfections of the Divine Loving (the Grace and Holiness of God, the Mercy

and Righteousness of God, the Patience and Wisdom of God), the Perfections of the Divine Freedom (the Unity and Omnipresence of God, the Constancy and Omnipotence of God, the Eternity and Glory of God).

Those who have worked their way through the other volumes hitherto translated will meet here also with the slow and ponderous steps of the exposition; the style that seems now more at home in the pulpit, now in the lecture-room, and now on the platform; the freedom from conventional presentations of Christian doctrine; and the flashes of inspiring and startling and illuminating thought, irradiating a dark and tortuous valley with unexpected suggestions. They will find also sections in small print, sometimes stretching over a dozen or more pages, to each of which a more compassionate author might have given the label, with advantage, of appendix or excursus; and they will ask themselves, as they doubtless did before, Why the title? The second word they will say in their unkind moments, is: 'Well enough; dogmatical, with all the author's assurance, and his neglect, not without a touch of contempt, of points of view that are not his own. Here too is his conviction that in his pages is truth, or it is nowhere. But as far as this book is concerned, what of the first word?'

It is indeed only after a time that we find we have been listening to a discussion on the articles of the Christian creeds—and on a good deal that is not in any of them; but so far from expounding the dogmas of the corpus of Christian theology, Barth does not conceal his dislike—he would perhaps use a stronger word—of some of the most venerable names. Augustine, Anselm, Aquinas are mentioned and quoted with respect; but when we have come to the last pages, only four names stand out in our recollection as true fathers of the Church: Luther, Calvin, Quenstadt and Polanus—another cautionary instance, perhaps, of the results of using that ambiguous word, Church, without care in explaining exactly in what sense we are using it. Kierkegaard, it may be noted, does not appear in the index.

But whatever the author thinks of the declared objects of his loyalty, he is recognizable in two respects as the Karl Barth we have known all along: he will have no 'natural theology'; and the God with whom we have to do is for a time, though not for very long, an Incognito. The whole doctrine of God, in fact, seems to grow out of these two articles. And the instructive autobiographical sketch, as it may be called, which he gives us towards the end of the book, shows them at work. In the first place, if we may attempt to sum up very briefly the 'dogmas' here set forth, the knowledge of God is bound to the Word of God. It is not so much God Himself that may be known as the knowledge of God; and this only by the grace of God, made wholly visible in Christ. God we may love; but we are obliged to fear Him. He grants us a certainty we can find nowhere else, though wrapped in mystery and identical with it. Moreover, we only know, and can know Him, as the Trinity. God is Father, Son, and Spirit. The Father knows the Son in the Spirit; that, and nothing but that, is the truth proved as it is from 'the Bible and dogma'—a significant combination. The author would even hint that we must see the Father, as the Son, on the Cross. It is this doctrine of the Trinity, indeed, which makes the Gospel 'respectable'. But it could never be learnt, save from and in the Word; and St Paul, in Athens, was no more a 'natural theologian' than was John; nor was his speech on the Areopagus a 'failure'; he knew what he was doing.

Thus God's readiness to reveal Himself must be met by man's readiness to receive the revelation. It is the duty of the Church to set forth and explain the Word; her worship begins in her thanks for the grace of God's 'knowability'. We rejoice as we receive it, and we respond with a 'sober exuberance' and awe. Such knowledge, so expressed, is the true sacrifice, well-pleasing to God. Inevitably it brings temptation, to relax our grasp on faith in the Word; but out of temptation springs comfort and a fresh consciousness of the divine grace. This brings us to the Reality of God, who wills and knows and decides. The revelation of His reality is authoritative because it is founded on itself. What is this will? That we should belong to Him, and He to us; and this spells grace and love. He wills because He loves, and loves because He wills. Hence His being is personal being. He is not merely He who is, but He who He is (as awkward a phrase in English as in any other language). As such, He is free and omnipotent. 'His freedom, and therefore the divinity of His love, is the freedom of His personality.' As such, again, He is the Absolute, and the world must be seen in the light of His 'aseity'. It is wholly inward, and wholly outward; and if this seems a contradiction, all contradictions (and there are not a few of them) are reconcilable in Christ.

Thus God is the Incognito no longer. The heart of this love-in-freedom is found in the Old Testament, where God's grace is before His holiness and His mercy before His righteousness. We can therefore, with Job, take refuge in His righteousness, knowing that Christ could suffer eternal death in our stead, as a consequence of our sin, in such a way that death was finally overcome. In His death we see that the anger and the long-suffering of God are one and the same. We can thus see how His activity is knowing and willing, and how His non-willing is itself a powerful willing. 'Evil, Death and hell are themselves known by God', and God's will is expressed in His Word, in the Bible. We are thus brought to other attributes of God, each of these a result of His perfections. He is in and beyond time; 'He acts in virtue of His spaciality'. He is immutable—that is, constant and continuous—as may be seen from His words to Amos and Moses and many another Old Testament seer. He can be said, and not figuratively, to 'repent'. His fore-ordination is a fact, but not inconsistent with our self-ordination. His being and His will are thus two sides of the same thing; if our prayers avail with Him, it is because He wills to be thus called on; if He is 'bound' to do this or that, it is because He has bound Himself. If He is chained, He has Himself forged the chains. His will is thus, as the schoolmen might say, antecedent, absolute, and occult. Its contents are all unknown apart from Himself. Similarly, the *kenosis* did not detract from Christ's being 'in the form of God'; it was known to us as He was a creature in this world. God's omnipotence may be seen from His omnicausality, or in His contraction of Himself into its opposite; it is something far more than could be lightly proved from His miracles. His *potentia absoluta* must be seen in His *potentia ordinata*, in His mighty acts—the deliverance from Egypt, the foundation of the Church, the Resurrection of Jesus. It is in this constancy, this omnipotence of knowing and willing, that His eternity is known; as an eternity that embraces time. 'God Himself, without ceasing to be eternal, took time, and made it His own.' In Jesus Christ He was able Himself to be temporal. He *is* eternity; and it was in pre-time that He resolved on the great

acts of redemption, the pre-time which is the 'pure time of the Father and the Son in the fellowship of the Holy Spirit'.

To conclude, it is when we recognize all this doctrine of His Being that we glorify Him. For His glory is His self-manifestation. We honour Him when we acknowledge that thus He manifests Himself, when, in the words of the Heidelberg Catechism, we are 'willing, ready from the heart, to live henceforth unto Him'; and this means not to dread, but to love this eternal purpose, to live so that God can be honoured, thanked, and served. 'If men will not do this' (to quote Polanus) 'God can raise up to Himself sons out of the stones; and of a surety the heavens declare the glory of God.'

It would be absurd to claim that these few paragraphs sum up this 'mighty work of vast intelligence'; yet they represent the main contentions of the author. He urges them with lavish variety of expression; yet, if far from simple, they are comparatively few in number. The brevity of the summary here attempted will suggest a bundle of aphorisms and perhaps of paradoxes; but the whole volume, for all its length, gives us something of the same impression, and readers who know their Barth will expect nothing else.

The translators have done their work well; the Scots use of 'will' for 'shall', however, occurs with almost amusing frequency. The numerous and often lengthy quotations from Latin writers are never translated; Barth no doubt took it for granted that his German and Swiss students would need no such service; but, considering the peculiarities and eccentricities of Barth's own *Wortschatz*, it would have been a kindness to readers not wholly unacquainted with German had they been told the originals of words which all translators must have found a difficulty in rendering into English. Misprints are few, and (laudably in such a work as this) for the most part trivial; but a few errors call for correction.

Still, as we put the book down, its very excellencies demand some further remark. What is the real character of its message, and what is the value of that message for the preacher and the Christian community? Consider, in the first place, Barth's use of the Bible, the Word of God, or (his more frequent appellation) Holy Scripture. In these days, when the 'higher criticism' is still by not a few supposed to have laid its axe at the root of Biblical authority, Barth's deep-rooted devotion to the Scriptures will be welcome; but no serious reader of this or indeed of Barth's other books can avoid asking, as he reads pages and pages of quotations from all parts of the Bible, arranged in no recognizable order, what is included actually in the term 'Scripture'? Are words from all parts of either Testament equally informing and authoritative? It cannot be said that the same conception of God's creative and redemptive will is to be found in the records of the Exodus, during the divided monarchy, after the exile and in Romans, 2 Peter and the Apocalypse. No single verse can be safely cut off from its context and regarded as clothed with the authority of Him who was the Incarnate Word of God. It is not enough to appeal, as many a popular teacher in all good faith may do, to 'what the Bible says', taking the words indifferently from Malachi, Daniel, or Koheleth. If that were allowed, some cynical critic might remark that one could defend, as the command of God, the execution of witches, divorces on as large a scale as Ezra contemplated, and the extermination of whole heathen populations.

And if the author should reply, with some indignation, 'I do not regard the



whole canon of Scripture as my province; I choose only doctrinal and religious passages, and of these only what I hope to bear out my contentions, and am patient of my interpretations', we cannot but ask him whether he is not virtually producing a Holy Scripture of his own. Surely a theologian who professes to base his conclusions on the Bible, but, like the majority of his predecessors (it must be confessed) till 100 years ago, pays no attention to the movements of Hebrew thought in the millennium before Christ, and to Christian thought in the century after the birth of Christ, is both neglecting a duty and surrendering an advantage. God does not only will and act in creation, redemption, and reconciliation, a triad constantly emphasized by our author. He acts in the 'constant and continuous' process by which the thoughts about Himself in the minds of holy and humble men of heart, inside and outside the canon, grow deeper and broader. It is the glory of Scripture that throughout the long centuries of its writing and its study men have brought their varying gifts to Him who is its centre, and its author. If we can, and must, with whatever measure of holiness and humility is vouchsafed to us, study that variety, who are we to claim that the final setting forth of the word has been revealed to us?

There is another aspect of this medievalism, as we may call it, that demands some comment. However we may depreciate or dread natural theology, we cannot separate God from His universe, the universe which we have learnt to see expanding so marvellously that 'astronomical' has come to stand for 'inconceivable', and in which 'matter', defying telescope and microscope alike, is ending by transfiguring itself into force, a force that may end by destroying us all. To the theologian bred up on the Bible of Psalm 104, Isaiah 40 and 2 Peter 2, the universe, stupendous as it is, is yet manageable; the world rests beneath 'that inverted bowl we call the sky', within it is the grave or pit, above it move the stars around the sun and moon, 'for ever singing as they shine the hand that made us is divine', and the Creator looks down on the children of men as if they lived on a flat plane above which at the last day the Judge will appear to summon them all before His throne. We can still catch ourselves moving in this pre-Copernican world in the works of some of our most venerated theological teachers. We may agree that 'for this world the word of God is Christ', and that we have no more to do with the moon or Mars than with Aldebaran; we may be content to confine our thought, as the Greek philosopher bade us, within the bounds of our own humanity. But if we have to speak of God, the Creator not only of our own little kosmos but of the whole vast universe, as being personal, our theology must none the less try to do some justice to His 'omnicausality'; to remember, that is to say, that if Christ is the Word of God, then the God with whom, in Him, we have to do, is a will and a purpose of whose unimagined vastness the Biblical writers never dreamt. This is not to turn from the light of the Bible to some St Elmo's fire of 'natural theology'; it is to find God in the shining of the stars as neither patriarch nor prophet nor 'Galileo in his turret' could find Him in their days. If we succeed, we may find Him more completely in His ways with men.

There is another matter which Barth treats with disappointing brevity—the relation of the Creator to evil and to sin. The two are not synonymous, though no two words are more carelessly confused and nothing is more disastrous than

such confusion. There is a clear distinction—clear, at all events, in all parts of the Bible—between what we dislike and what God dislikes. The same object, feeling, or act may appear in both categories; but, properly speaking, the Biblical words, both Hebrew and Greek, which refer to the former are represented by 'evil', the latter are spoken of as 'sin'. God's relation as Creator and Deliverer to the first is clearly different from His relation to the second. We may come to see that it was good that we were afflicted, as the Psalmist said; but was it good that we sinned?

All this is unnoticed by the author. 'Evil' indeed does not appear in the index; 'sin' does, yet with a strange absence of really careful treatment. As in the volume on Reconciliation, Barth is more anxious to speak of God's love as redeeming us from sin through grace. But how came the 'omnicausal', the all-knowing, the all-foreseeing, all-foreordaining to create the human race which, if to know all is to will all, He destined to so dire and lasting an infection? Was sin a *felix culpa*, the only door through which grace could admit God's ultimate gift of universal redemption? On the other hand, all men are classed by Barth, as by most writers on the subject, as either saints or sinners. For this all will acknowledge high Biblical authority, as far as the doctrinal sections go. Yet whether we think of the Biblical characters, or of the men and women of our own experience, such a dichotomy is unworkable. Most people, though hardly in the Lutheran sense, are *justi simul ac peccatores*. Even if we find an acid test in the deliberate acceptance or rejection of Christ as Saviour, it is not and it never has been applicable to more than a small minority of the race.

This is the reason why the preaching of sin today awakens so little fear or even concern, and is itself generally so hesitant and half-hearted. We are too well aware of the infinite gradations of sinfulness in the men and women around us. Has not Barth, we may ask, read his Shakespeare, his Goethe, or even the records of Nuremberg? He would perhaps reply that he had much else to read, adding, 'and so have my critics'. But human sin is far too complex and too serious to be dealt with in a book like this by platitudes and generalities. It is useless to confront men today with 'sin is pride', or 'sin is covetousness', or sin is 'refusal to believe'. The preacher has still to deal with the '*quanti ponderis peccatum*' of Anselm, and Barth does not help him. It may be that this subject will be dealt with more satisfactorily and elaborately in some other part of the whole work. But in that case the reader is justified in complaining that no hint is given of the author's general conclusion where it is certainly needed. On this refusal, if the word is not unfair, the autobiographical excursus already referred to casts some light. Barth is there describing how he and his friends drew away from Hegel and dialectics on the one hand, and from Harnack and liberalism on the other, to a recognition of the importance of eschatology and of the fact that God's Kingdom was nothing like the socialism to which so many then were turning wistful eyes. God, he saw, is eternal, that is, supra-temporal. After 1919, there seemed no hope of the establishment of a Christian society on earth; nothing was left but theological treatises and magazines. The one hesitating reference to ethics at the end of the long section would suggest that Barth has forgotten how every one of the Pauline Epistles leads up to a section on the conduct of the Christian in society, and that he does not recognize that to think of Schweitzer is really to think of Lambarene more than of Wrede.

One other comment must be made. Admittedly dogmatics will often have to travel far from Biblical texts. Its task is to turn its light, if need be ruthlessly, on what it finds implied therein, to sharpen and then to reconcile contradictions, to deal with the solemn verbiage of the Athanasian creed, and to discuss fate, free-will, foreknowledge absolute, even though it may find itself in wandering mazes, and in danger of turning God the Father into a school divine. To such a task Barth has devoted all his powers in this book, and a glance at the index will show how the pages of the Bible have been open before him continuously. For this reason it is all the more strange that the conception of God as the Heavenly Father, the name habitually on the lips of Jesus, should have had so little attention paid to it. We can understand its neglect by the medieval schoolmen. They were, most of them, by their office, doomed, or exalted, to celibacy. They might, on occasion, allow themselves the passionate language of the Song of Songs, but they could know nothing of the emotions lying behind Luke 15 or 2 Samuel 18. We should however have expected our author, with the stress he lays on Holy Scripture, to have made more use of what is surely the centre of the Saviour's doctrine of God, alike as proclaimed in the Synoptic records and as illuminated in the Upper Room chapters of the Fourth Gospel. The result of his neglect is that love and the will, the freedom and the knowledge and the constancy of God are left with sadly little content.

God sees with equal eye a hero perish or a sparrow fall. He wills, in His mercy, the redemption of the fallen race; but the categories in which we think of His acts are about as bloodless as those whose dance shocked F. H. Bradley. The contradictions are all, we are told, reconcilable; but they are not reconciled. They cannot be till they are seen as springing from personal relations which are not simply affirmed, as Barth affirmed them, but felt. Freedom and limitation, dependancy and initiative, the present and the future, command and obedience, receiver and giver, cannot be clearly seen and understood, save as in the union of the Father and the Son; and—if we include with those the sinner and the sinless, the perfect and the imperfect, attachment and struggle, the eternal and the temporal—where else can we find them than in the union of the Father through the only begotten Son with His believing children? It is strange that Barth has no more than two passing allusions to John 17<sup>11, 21</sup>. When we stand there, both human fatherhood and sonship receive and communicate a kindred light. Human fatherhood can only be understood from its divine pattern laid up in Heaven; yet the pattern, to our eyes, grows the brighter for its earthly embodiment.

Thus, too, the attributes love, will, freedom, knowledge, so disappointingly empty and formal in this book, grow, as we find them in the New Testament, full-blooded. Tennyson lived and wrote long before Karl Barth, yet he might have known the catastrophes that shook Barth's world, and have seen the deeds which seemed either to mock the will of God or to show forth His Glory, when he wrote the lines, staled neither by time nor familiarity—

*O living will that shalt endure  
When all that seems shall suffer shock,  
Rise in the Spiritual rock,  
Flow through our deeds and make them pure.*

And if Barth could have looked through the eyes of a Tennyson and seen man—

*Battered with the shocks of doom  
To shape and use,*

and, behind and above man

*That God which ever lives and loves,  
One God, one law, one element,*

he might have wrought his eschatology into the

*One divine far-off event  
To which the whole creation moves.*

It would ill become one who has spent many years in the teaching of theology to depreciate the honour of that 'Queen of the sciences', still less to be disrespectful to Karl Barth or the Barthianism whose paternity Barth shrank from acknowledging. Whenever we open the book, we come across some aphorism, some epigram, some paradox, which, if it refuses to make clear and plain the thought of its author, challenges or teases the reader into re-examining the thoughts of his own mind. But theology cannot be content with less than the whole counsel of God and the wide content of the mind of man. She forgets man's 'burning fears', his 'hissing tears', at her peril. Confine her within a classroom, shut the door and draw the blinds, and you bid her dig her own grave. She must search the Scriptures, the Fathers, and the broad fields of Christian dogma; but she must remember to whom she must come to find life. If she had always done this, some of her noblest sons would not then have become as a John-a-dreams, unpregnant of their cause. She may not strive or cry in the street; but she must guard the broken reed, and she must 'placard', as they can hear it, the whole Gospel of the grace of God in the ears of dying men.

W. F. LOFTHOUSE

<sup>1</sup> Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 55s.

## ST CYPRIAN OF CARTHAGE

Born *c.* AD 200; martyred on 16th September AD 258

CYPRIAN DOES not count as one of the great theological Fathers of the Church. His great influence on his own and subsequent generations, and not least on the Churches of the Anglican Communion, is due not so much to his pronouncements on high matters of doctrine as to his application of accepted Christian principles to the successive crises which afflicted the Church of Carthage over which he presided. He was a bishop for a mere ten years, but that decade was crowded with emergencies, and his handling of them brought out into the open several issues which might otherwise have gone unnoticed, and at the same time his own very distinctive attitude to them. We can scarcely hope to understand his convictions unless we have some knowledge of the situations which brought them to expression.

Like many others who later became famous as Christian divines—Tertullian, Augustine, Calvin, to name only a few—Cyprian was trained in the law. Helped by family wealth and natural endowments of intellect and eloquence, he established and maintained a large legal practice, until at about the age of forty-six he was converted to Christianity by the persuasiveness of a presbyter named Caecilian. Christianity had only just begun to gain a hold on the educated classes in the Romanized province of Carthage, and Cyprian's adhesion to it in 246 was the first important sign of a movement among Carthaginian intellectuals which by the end of the third century changed the whole character of the Church. Cyprian was probably baptized at Easter, 246, and two years later he was consecrated Pope of Carthage (the title Pope was not yet used of the Bishop of Rome, but only of the Bishop of Carthage). The appointment was made by popular suffrage, followed by the consent of neighbouring bishops—a reversal of the arrangement then growing up by which the bishops chose their colleague, and the people assented. But the election was not unanimous, for when Cyprian was reluctant to accept it, his reluctance was keenly supported by a group of presbyters headed by an aggrieved rival called Novatus. Nevertheless, Cyprian was induced to accept office.

The first eighteen months of his episcopate were uneventful, but the remainder amply made up for this. The Church throughout the whole Empire had enjoyed freedom from molestation for many years, for the rulers of Rome had been so busy protecting the frontiers against invasion and so occupied in plotting against each other that they had had no time to spare for persecution; and in any case some of them had been in favour of a universal religion with Christianity as one of its elements. But Decius, who acceded in 249, had different ideas. He was sure that the decay of Rome was due to the subtle and pernicious infiltration of the Christian faith, and set himself to liquidate it. He enacted that everyone who did not sacrifice to the pagan gods by a stated date should be tried and tortured, and, if he did not give way, executed. Cyprian went underground in January 250, and continued to administer his diocese as best he could from his retreat. Novatus and his friends were quick to interpret this as a sign of cowardice, and they persuaded the clergy in Rome, which maintained very close relations with Carthage throughout this period, to take a



similarly high-minded view. But Cyprian stayed where he was; nor was his popularity greatly undermined. Of course, his attitude in this crisis raises a perennial problem for the Church under persecution. There were many pastors and professors in the German Church in the time of Hitler whose hearts and minds were with the Confessional Movement, but who judged it best to continue quietly with their work in order to keep the younger generation free from contamination. Cyprian would not have blamed them.

In Carthage for nearly two years the persecution was grim. Many held fast to their faith, and suffered for it, though the Government was reluctant to make martyrs of them. Others gave way, and went the whole length of sacrificing to the gods; others, again, compromised, and obtained certificates from complaisant officials (no doubt on payment of a fee) that they had sacrificed, though in fact they had not. As the persecution was slightly relaxed, the Novatus party saw another opportunity of discrediting Cyprian. Those who had lapsed from the faith showed signs of wanting to return. So Novatus persuaded the Confessors (as the men who had stood out against all inducement to betray the faith were called) to issue 'certificates of pardon' which covered the repentant 'lapsed' with their own merits, and even to put out a blanket absolution of all those who had lapsed and were now willing to return to the fold. He then informed Cyprian of these arrangements, and asked him to approve them. Cyprian refused, saying that the procedure suggested was as irregular as Novatus' manners were bad and his Latin style regrettable. He reserved the whole matter of the return of the lapsed to the Church until properly constituted Councils could arrive at decisions of policy, but he did allow those who were *in extremis* to be readmitted to the Church on production of a 'certificate of pardon'.

Novatus was not deterred. He supported a certain Felicissimus, who was demanding greater and greater lenity for the returning lapsed, and making the matter a vantage-point from which to attack Cyprian personally. Then he made off to Rome to foment opposition to Cyprian there also. In this city there was no bishop; after the death of the last one, Decius' remark that he would rather hear of a rival Emperor than of a bishop set up in Rome had discouraged the Church from making the appointment. The leading cleric was Novatian, who was opposed to Cyprian's views on precisely the opposite grounds to those which officially appealed to Novatus; he was in favour of much greater strictness towards the lapsed than Cyprian wished for. This did not prevent Novatus from immediately joining his party; any stick was good enough for beating Cyprian.

Decius was killed in battle in 251, and the persecution was suspended. Cyprian emerged from hiding at Easter in that year—and not a moment too soon. A week or two before, Cornelius, not Novatian, had been elected Bishop of Rome, and Novatian's party had induced him to set up as rival bishop. Felicissimus remained to be dealt with in Carthage, and the whole problem of readmitting the lapsed was now urgent. Cyprian called a Council of his diocese, which settled the outstanding questions in accordance with the lead which he gave. Felicissimus was condemned forthwith. Cornelius was acknowledged as true Bishop of Rome, and Novatian disavowed. The Council next took the drastic course of entirely disregarding the Confessors' 'certificates of pardon', and decided that the case of each returning penitent should be considered on its

merits, in accordance with the general principles, (a) that those who had merely sacrificed on paper to the pagan gods should be re-admitted one by one after due penance, (b) that those who had really sacrificed should be re-admitted *in extremis* if they continued penitent to the end (and had not postponed the start of penitence until they knew their end was near), and (c) that lapsed clergy should be deposed without hope of reinstatement.

These statesmanlike decisions are surely models for the Church's discipline in any age. It cannot readmit to communion those guilty of flagrant sin as soon as they profess repentance. God, indeed, knows whether the repentance is sincere; but it is not so easy for His earthly representatives. Until the repentant sinner has duly fulfilled a probationary period, he can well show the genuineness of his repentance by his faithful acceptance of the Church's discipline. Nor, on the other hand, may the Church exclude a man for ever from its communion if he evinces repentance; for 'the Lord is gracious and full of compassion'. The purity of the Church can be bought at too high a price, as Novatian failed to see. Above all, repentance is a matter of persons, not of rules; and the Church is surely right to look at each case of discipline, compassionately on its merits.

It was in connexion with the Council of 251 that Cyprian published his most famous writing, *On the Unity of the Church*. The prevailing theme of this is that unity is of the very essence of the Church, and that anyone who breaks it—for instance, the Novatianists in Rome—tears the seamless robe of Christ, lives in adultery, and is a stranger to the promises of God. Cyprian's most-quoted utterance comes in this context: 'he can no longer have God for his Father who has not the Church for his mother'. This is, strictly, not about someone who attempts to be a Christian without belonging to the Church, but someone who breaks the unity of the Church by going into schism.

The unity of the Church, says Cyprian, stems from Peter, on whom Christ built His Church, and his successor, the Bishop of Rome. It is clear from several of Cyprian's subsequent dealings with one particular Bishop of Rome, Stephen, that he ascribed no doctrinal or jurisdictional primacy to the Bishop of Rome; he takes him as the embodiment and source of unity. He goes on to speak of the unity and solidarity of the episcopate, which is itself an embodiment of the Church's unity. But this does not mean that each bishop must abide by the decisions of the whole body of bishops, for 'each part' of the total episcopate 'is held by each one for the whole'. This rather difficult phrase seems to mean that the episcopate is a kind of legal joint property in which each share-holder holds the totality—in the same way as a member of one of Rome's collegiate magistracies, such as the tribunate, was held to possess the fullness of the magistracy. In practice we are to conclude that the whole body of bishops is supreme, and so is each individual Bishop in his own diocese, since he is the representative of the whole. This doctrine is not only hard to express and understand, but even harder to carry into execution, as Cyprian himself found out a few years later. Yet it has been the endeavour of the Church of England in many periods to adhere to it, and we shall look to the Lambeth Conference of this current year to interpret it in the terms of our time.

After the 251 Council the ecclesiastical atmosphere was much clearer, but the physical atmosphere was not. In fact, a death-dealing plague descended on the Western part of the Roman Empire and settled on it for twenty years; it

frightened off the barbarians from the frontiers, and killed off, at one time, five thousand Romans a day. Its attack on Carthage was severe for two years, and Cyprian organized a burial fund and a nursing staff for Christians and non-Christians alike. Moreover, Gallus, Decius' successor, resumed the persecution of the Church, though he was not so efficient as Decius had been. Gallus was killed in 253, and Valerian, who took his place, called off the persecution, only to re-introduce it four years later. But those four years gave a breathing-space, and the chance for Cyprian to be involved in another doctrinal-disciplinary controversy.

The first flush of moralistic enthusiasm among the Novatianists in Rome was now over, and many of the schismatics wanted to come back to the mother Church; there was also a fairly constant trickle of re-converted Marcionites and other heretics. The awkward question was: should these returning prodigals be baptized (or re-baptized, as some put it)? Stephen, Bishop of Rome, was, not unnaturally, anxious to strengthen and unite his Church in the face of a persecution which might break out at any moment, and his own instinct was for leniency. He ruled that if baptism had been administered with water and the use of the Triune Name, it was valid and unrepeatable, whoever had administered it; the character, doctrines and relation to the Church of the ministrant had nothing to do with the case. The problem was brought to Cyprian's notice, and it became gradually a practical one in Carthage as in Rome. Cyprian was quite clear that baptism was not valid unless the ministrant held a right view of the Trinity and was also in a right relation to the Church. Thus both heretical and schismatical baptisms were excluded, and those coming into the true Church from heretical and schismatical bodies must be baptized.

Councils in Rome and Carthage issued contradictory pronouncements. Cyprian was fairly polite in his intimation to Stephen of his Council's ruling, admitting that Stephen had a perfect right to hold and practise his own views in his own diocese. Stephen was not at all polite in his response, calling Cyprian a 'false Christ' and a 'false apostle', and stating that he would hold no communion with bishops who practised 'second baptism'. This aroused the ire of some bishops in the East who agreed with Cyprian, and a schism of the first magnitude might well have developed if Stephen had not opportunely died, just before Valerian re-introduced the persecution of the Church.

Cyprian was wrong-headed, no doubt, on this issue. If we are to hold that the character or theology of the minister invalidates a sacrament, we are doubting the efficacy of Christ's work and sending ourselves on an endless chase after guaranteed good character and complete orthodoxy in every minister of the Gospel. But the matter has to be looked at in a larger context. Cyprian was trying to hold together two views of the Church which seem to be contradictory, yet are both necessary. It is indeed the congregation of saints, as Novatian, and now Cyprian, sought to ensure by strict terms of admission; but it is also the home of sinners, as Cyprian had testified, against Novatian, by keeping the door open for returning traitors. Cyprian held these two views together in his own mind, and in the Church of Carthage during his lifetime; they fell apart, not many years later, in the disastrous Donatist controversy, in which both sides were so very right, and also so very wrong.

Even Cyprian's bitterest opponents were silenced by the manner of his death.

Valerian's representative, the Proconsul, exiled him fifty miles away to Curubis, where he lived in remote but real contact with his flock for a year. Then he was ordered to Carthage; the Proconsul was too ill to try his case, and Cyprian had still to wait. He was given a chance to escape, but this time refused to take it. The Proconsul recovered, and sent guards to take Cyprian to Utica, where he proposed to try him. But Cyprian was resolved to die among his own people, and managed to hide himself from the guards. When the Proconsul came back to Carthage, Cyprian came out of his hiding-place and gave himself up. He was duly tried, and beheaded.

RUPERT E. DAVIES

---

### PASCAL'S PROVINCIAL LETTERS, 1656-7

THREE hundred years ago appeared the *Provincial Letters* of Blaise Pascal, which Voltaire said combined the wit of Molière with the sublimity of Bossuet (a judgement alluded to in Wesley's *Journal*, 13th October 1752). This satirical yet deeply earnest work receives continual tributes still to the purity of its French style, the brilliance and lightness of its wit, and the earnestness of its religious and moral intent. It is certainly worth re-reading now, when once again the tide seems set towards laxity in morals and accommodation of religion to those who do not want to be too seriously inconvenienced by its practice.

The Counter-Reformation owed much to the ceaseless and ubiquitous efforts, machinations, and heroic self-sacrifices of the Society of Jesus and its price was the triumph of the Semi-Pelagian theology favoured by the Order. The various wars of religion that filled the century following the Reformation led at last to an exhaustion of the spirit, and a temper little inclined to take religion too seriously or to undergo severe discipline in its exercise. In the France of Louis XIV, Catholicism triumphed, and the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes signalized its triumph, but it was an outward victory accompanied by little inward grace. The Jesuits saw clearly that if the courtiers of 'Le Roi Soleil' were to be held to the Church, the Church must not be too exacting in its demands. Thus 'casuistry', which ought to be a legitimate and necessary matter of applying the law of Christ to common life and giving guidance to troubled consciences, became in their hands a means of evading the moral demands of the gospel altogether, and

destroying the commandments of God by means of the traditions of men.

The triumph of the new Semi-Pelagianism, however, was never complete; it hardly could or can be so long as St Augustine stands among the most venerated doctors of the Church. And it was a re-presentation of Augustinian teachings by Jansenius, Bishop of Ypres (1585-1638), in a work entitled *Augustinus*, that led to the greatest internal tension in the Roman Catholic Church in the seventeenth century. After all, Luther and Calvin had been great Augustinians too, and it was scarcely possible to republish much of Augustine's teaching without seeming to approximate to theirs. 'Jansenism' always protested its sincere loyalty to the Roman Church, but was always suspected of being near-Protestant; and though it was too severe ever to be a popular doctrine, its spread in seventeenth-century France aroused the concern of the Jesuits, who saw in it a serious challenge to their power.

The centre of Jansenist influence in France was the Cistercian nunnery of Port-Royal, near Paris, which Blaise Pascal's sister, Jacqueline, entered in 1652. It was to the circle connected with this convent that Pascal owed his own deepest convictions and conversion, and though perhaps never a thorough-going Jansenist, he flew to their aid when the Jesuit attack broke upon them.

The chief offender of the Jesuits was Antoine Arnauld, a confessor of the Port-Royal community and doctor of the Sorbonne, who had the temerity to say that he had carefully read the writing of Jansenius, and was unable to find in them the five propositions which had been condemned as heretical by a bull of Pope Innocent X in 1653. Good Catholic as he was, however, he added that nevertheless he recognized the heretical nature of the propositions, and *if they were in the Augustinus*, he condemned them! The real point at issue, however, was not the five propositions, but the moral challenge of Port-Royal to the lax moral teachings of the Jesuits, and the standing threat to their power so long as there remained this serious rival for the leadership of French Catholicism. In 1655 the Jesuits extracted certain propositions from the writings of Arnauld himself and sought to have them censured by the University of the Sorbonne.

The need for a riposte was clear, and Arnauld attempted something himself, which he read to a circle of his friends at Port-Royal. Their polite but unenthusiastic response showed him that his efforts were not likely to succeed with a wider and less friendly-disposed public, and, looking round the company, his eye fell upon Pascal, who agreed to undertake the task. Thus it came about that the first of the series of the *Provincial Letters* was written, and burst upon a delighted public in January 1656. The series continued, under the pseudonym of 'Louis de Montalte', until 1657. Every effort to prevent their publication and circulation failed. They were eagerly bought up and carried into every part of France, and far beyond it. Their immediate success, in the sense of gaining a wide public, and setting the world laughing at the Jesuits, was complete.

Cast in the form of letters, the earlier ones purport to be written from a Parisian to a friend in the provinces, telling him all about the controversy. The later ones are addressed as 'open letters', to the Jesuits themselves. There are eighteen in all, and they may be divided into three groups, in which a progressively graver tone can be discerned from the earlier (and shorter) to the later (and longer) letters.



In the first group of three letters, Pascal deals with the chicanery and intrigues leading to the censure of M. Arnauld (which occurred at the end of January, 1656). The first letter strikes the pitch, reporting, in an easy conversational style, visits to representatives of different parties to learn what exactly all the controversy is about. It shows that Jesuits and Dominicans (the latter were Thomists in theology) have managed to combine against the Jansenists only by adopting a new term ('proximate power') which they really understand in totally different senses. The conversation concludes thus:

'In other words', said I, on quitting them, 'it is necessary to pronounce this word, for fear of being heretical in name. Is it a Scripture term?' 'No,' said they. 'Is it from the Fathers, or Councils, or Popes?' 'No.' 'Is it from St Thomas?' 'No.' 'What necessity then, is there for saying it, since it has neither authority nor meaning in itself?' 'You are obstinate,' say they. 'You shall say it, or you shall be heretical, and M. Arnauld also; for we are the majority, and if need be, we will bring Cordeliers enough to carry it!'

Letters II and III continue the demonstration that much of the attack on Arnauld is mere logomachy, and that since his propositions can all be paralleled from Fathers of undeniable orthodoxy, his opponents are driven to resort to subtle distinctions of sense, perceptible to none but themselves, to taint him with heresy.

This lesson was enough [he concludes]. It taught me that the heresy here was of a new species. It is not the sentiments of M. Arnauld, but his person that is heretical. It is a personal heresy! . . . Let him do what he may, unless he cease to live, he will never be a good Catholic. The grace of St Augustine will never be true so long as he shall defend it. . . .

Here, then, let us have done with these disputes. They are quarrels of theologians, not questions of theology.

Letters IV to X, accordingly, turn to what becomes the real subject of the series—the casuistical teachings of the Jesuits. In a series of reported imaginary conversations with a Jesuit Father, Pascal introduces quotation after quotation from authoritative Jesuit writers on moral theology, to show how in their efforts to become all things to all men, the casuists are able to find ways of allowing almost every conceivable sin and crime, even assassination, homicide, simony, perjury, theft, and many more. The great strength of the work lies in the carefully documented references to works of moral theology by Jesuit authors then in great repute, such as Escobar, Lessius, Bauni, and others. Pascal exposes the various devices used to get round the existing moral maxims of the gospel and the Fathers. Some sins are got rid of by so defining them as to make it extremely unlikely that they would ever be committed; others by devices such as the practice of 'equivocation', whereby perjury is avoided by using language of double meaning; but the master-device of all is the doctrine of 'Probabilism'. According to this, any doctrine in moral theology is 'probable' if even one doctor of weight has propounded it. And the probability of one opinion does not diminish that of its opposite. Moreover, in guiding consciences, the confessor is

safe in following any 'probable' opinion in this sense. Since by the devices mentioned above, 'grave' doctors can be quoted in permission of almost any kind of behaviour, it follows that confessors may indulge their 'penitents' in almost any kind of conduct, even the most abandoned, vicious, and licentious, if they are not disposed to amend. For the lengths to which this could go, readers must be referred to the letters themselves.

Perhaps the lowest depths of all are touched in the discussion, 'How often is it necessary to love God?' Various doctors are quoted. Some think every Sunday, some on festival days, some every three, four, or five years. One concludes that 'in strictness we are not obliged to aught else than to observe the other commandments without any love for God, and without giving Him our heart, provided we do not hate Him'.

This solemn and blasphemous trifling leads to a noble outburst from the author, which concludes this part of the series:

'O father,' said I, 'no patience can stand this. It is impossible to listen without horror to the things which I have just heard. . . . The licence which they have taken to shake the holiest rules of Christian conduct proceeds the length of entirely subverting the law of God! They violate the great commandment which contains the law and the prophets; they attack piety in the heart; they take away the spirit that gives life; they say the love of God is not necessary to salvation; they even go so far as to pretend that "this dispensation from loving God is the advantage which Jesus Christ brought into the world". . . .'

So end the reported conversations. The eleventh and following letters are addressed to the Jesuit Fathers, and while equally earnest in tone, become longer, and drop the conversational form. In part they reply to Jesuit answers to earlier letters, and they cover the same ground again with renewed quotation of authorities. Their powerful hortatory style of direct address to the Jesuits, while losing something of the lightness of earlier letters, gathers the irresistible force of a controlled moral fury. Rightly does the author exclaim: 'It were to be wished that these horrible maxims had never come out of hell; and that the devil, the first author of them had never found men so devoted to his orders as to publish them among Christians.'

Later letters turn to the theological questions involved in the five condemned propositions, and it was perhaps feeling himself on less secure ground here that the author abruptly terminated the series.

The immediate popularity of the letters has already been seen. But it is well known that they could not save Port-Royal or the Jansenist movement from the fury of the Jesuits. Their success in destroying Port-Royal, however, was after all but a Pyrrhic victory, and the *Provincial Letters* show us why. That a movement should gain the ascendancy in Catholicism by such means and upon such principles as the letters reveal in the Jesuits could only hasten the moral degeneration of the French Church itself. The victory of the casuists marks one more stage in the divorce of morality from religion, and in the enfeeblement of the latter, which many would find so sad an aspect of French life in the last three centuries. The destruction first of Protestantism, then of Jansenism, left a situation in which the more sensitive moral natures were shocked and repelled by the Church. '*Écrasez l'infâme!*' became a cry capable of arousing a deep and

heartfelt response in natures not to be dismissed as ungenerous. The too complete triumph of Christianity in this morally devitalized form over all rival presentations of the same faith has led to a situation where no third way is seen between Roman Catholicism and anticlerical atheism.

Of course, even this dubious triumph was not long shared by the Jesuit order. Nemesis overtook them more swiftly. Government after government banished them from its domains during the next century, and in 1773 the Order was disbanded by Pope Clement XIV. The dissolution was never fully effective, and the Society contrived to continue; but that is beyond our subject.

It was not that the Jesuit position was wholly wrong, though a Protestant may be forgiven for feeling that they put themselves as much in the wrong as they possibly could, and made the worst of their case. A 'purple passage' quoted by Pascal from Brisacier in Letter XV points to the best defence of the Jesuit position. Defending a passage quoted in the earlier letter from Bauni, which directs that a confessor is to grant absolution even when he sees no real hope of amendment, Brisacier says:

In fact, Father Bauni says what you relate; but do you who censure it wait when a penitent is at your feet, till his guardian angel pledges all the rights he has to heaven for his security: wait till God the Father swears by his head that David lied when he said all men are liars, deceitful and frail; and till this penitent be no longer lying, frail, fickle and sinful like others, and you will not apply the blood of Christ to anyone.

This passage borders on blasphemy; yet it points to the one good motive behind the Jesuit system—a motive which, however corrupted, must evoke some sympathy. Granted a system in which confession and absolution play so important a role, how serious a thing it is to refuse absolution and so perhaps cut off from the 'means of grace' that very sin-sick soul which needs grace most! Just how much sign of genuine repentance and amendment of life should a confessor require in order to absolve? Obviously something short of complete sanctity on the one hand, and something better than continuance in abandoned licentiousness on the other. But where in between is he to pitch his requirements?

That the Jesuits went so much too far as to bring the whole system into contempt is clear enough. Perhaps if the Jansenists had triumphed they would have done almost as much to make religion hateful on the other tack, by setting it upon the course of extreme austerity which has sometimes made the name of Puritan obnoxious in England. There are not wanting signs of a fierce and fanatical asceticism in Pascal himself which has caused it to be said that though we might admire and even follow him, we could never love him.

Be that as it may, a Protestant (and Pascal, be it remembered, was never one, even in thought) may perhaps think that much of the difficulty arises from the Catholic rejection of 'Justification by Faith', that doctrine which has been well said to cut away the errors of Rome by the very roots. A genuine repentance, a genuine confidence in Christ and Christ alone for salvation, results in a turning of the whole nature towards the light, so that it becomes unthinkable to ask how often can I do this or that, or how near to this or that known sin can I sail and still be a Christian. Unless the whole set of one's sails, so to speak, is away from these things, one is not a Christian at all; but if it be so, then the number and

depth of one's lapses become a matter of secondary importance, depending very much upon background, early training, the temptations due to temperament or environment, and so on. A real Christian never asks, 'How can I cling to this sin and get away with it?'; he rather cries

*O for a heart to praise my God,  
A heart from sin set free!*

Liberty to sin is for such a man no liberty at all; liberty from sin is what he seeks, but until he has it, the all-atoning Sacrifice is his refuge, not a priestly absolution depending upon some nicely calculated casuistical decision as to just how far he can go without 'mortal sin', or how much sin he can cling to and still claim to be penitent.

A re-reading of the *Provincial Letters* may not be amiss if it makes us ask once again just where the difference lies between this evil calculus of sins-and-pardons and evangelical faith, and so becomes one more path to the foot of the Cross.

G. THACKRAY EDDY

---

### SOME EXAMPLES OF NEW TESTAMENT TEACHING RELEVANT TO THE TREATMENT OF STAMMERING

WHEN I first qualified as a speech therapist I was careful to avoid any mention of religion. My approach was confined to the methods I had learnt when training. I found, however, that when treating stammerers I would occasionally refer to the Bible if it seemed apposite, and when I did so these remarks were often eagerly taken up.

This article gives some instances of New Testament teaching which I have found myself using in treatment. I say 'found myself using', because that is how it happened. I never attempted to plan treatment and decide that now was the time to introduce, for example, the Parable of the Wheat and the Tares. These thoughts intruded themselves and I used them before I realized what I had done.

My approach to the stammerer is always as to one who is in trouble and has a stammer as a symptom of his inner discord. Because of this, it follows that much

of what I have to say about the treatment of stammering applies to other forms of suffering, and I have also frequently used these New Testament illustrations when helping neurotics.

The stammerer longs to be rid of his stammer. That is what he has come to the therapist for, and it is often difficult to get him to talk about anything else. When he is told it will be some time before there is any marked decrease in his stammering, he is crestfallen. He may try to appear as if he accepts it readily, but below the surface there is bitter disappointment or perhaps the idea that in his case it will be different and he will soon be cured. But beyond all this, the time comes when it must be conveyed to him that not only must he be prepared to endure his stammer for longer, but his stammer must even be allowed to appear worse. This is a hard saying and he can, of course, only accept it when he is ready for it.

'Let both grow together until the harvest'—that is what must happen. The free speech and the stammering must be allowed to grow unimpeded and without any attempt to prolong one or curtail the other. This is exactly contrary to all the stammerer has been doing since first he realized his speech handicap.<sup>1</sup>

The stammerer began as a rhythmic repetition, such as 'm-m-mummy'. The sufferer was for some reason at about the age of five unable to co-ordinate mental processes with verbal patterns, and consequently reverted to a more infantile stage of speech; he used again the babble of a baby. This repetitive stammer would very likely have gone of itself if only he had been allowed to get on with it; but from the disapproval of parents and teachers he learnt that it must not continue. As a result, he began using all manner of devices to stop himself. This inevitably led to an increase of tension, and the repetitive, or clonic stammer became more serious; it showed itself as a 'block' or 'hold up' characteristic of the tonic phase. As the stammerer strains more and more his distress may be increased until the whole body may be contorted in an agonized effort to get the words out.

How great is the revulsion from the simple form of rhythmic reiteration may be judged from the fact that Stein records that the majority of his patients deny that it has ever taken place, and even if it is confirmed by parents and other observers they will still refuse to accept the fact. Both the stammerer himself and those who watch him unconsciously resent the rhythmic reiteration of the initial stages, partly because it is a regression to a more infantile level, but also because of its erotic nature.

The Parable of the Wheat and the Tares prescribes the treatment for the stammerer, especially when he is in the second stage and trying to force the words out without any repetition. He must allow the stammer to come out as a repetitive stammer. Of course, this is most difficult and cannot be done as a deliberate effort. Only slowly and gradually can this stage be reached. It is made more difficult by the attitude of friends and relatives, who, directly he begins to use a repetitive stammer, will show great concern and convey by looks, if not by words, that he is getting worse instead of better, and suggest a different course of treatment.

I remember treating a girl of ten who came to my speech clinic with a stammer which, to the uninitiated, appeared very mild, because it only showed itself as a hesitation at the beginning of each sentence or phrase. I had only recently been



qualified, and so was armed with a whole battery of treatment which I was eager to use. However, she was not interested in anything I had to say about her stammer. It was not so much that she listened with complete indifference, but rather that she looked at me in a kindly way which was a gentle rebuke for my attempts to interfere. After a while, when I had exhausted all my technique, I realized that she was much wiser than I. With rather damaged pride, I allowed her to set the theme for our weekly sessions. For many weeks it was comic papers which occupied our attention, and I became enthralled by the adventures in *The Secret Four* and *Jenny Lane, the Girl Detective*. My professional pride suffered a fresh blow when she arrived with her knitting. This I felt was going too far. After all, I was paid as a speech therapist, and here I was sitting chatting to a girl doing her knitting. At this time I was attending a post-graduate course in the study of psychogenic speech disorders at the Tavistock Clinic under the direction of Dr Stein, and I mentioned my patient to him. His answer was simple and direct: let the girl get on with her knitting.

It was nine months (a significant period?) after first coming to me that the girl's stammer began to change. She began using a repetitive stammer which soon became more pronounced. Her mother arrived at my clinic in great alarm and made it very clear what her estimate was of my skill. I attempted to calm her, explain what was happening and persuade her to wait patiently. The girl herself was now ready to listen to me. She had good intelligence and I think I made my point. The conclusion was a happy one, for after five or six weeks the stammer grew rapidly less, and finally left her. Both had grown together until the time was ripe, until the harvest.

'Let both grow together until the harvest.' Of course the owner of the land knew that his men would pull out good seedlings as well as weeds if they attempted any clearing up before the harvest. Only when fully grown could the weeds be clearly seen and dealt with. So too with the stammerer. Any sudden attempt to root out the stammer is fraught with danger. If this is accomplished by some zealous but misguided person, then it is probable that some other symptom will replace it. The stammerer himself must be able to see his stammer as it is and know what it means. Instead of attempting to deny its existence or choke it back, he must gradually be brought to look at it and accept it, to know it for what it is. He must, as Jung advocates, learn to love the rebel within himself. He must see the good which is there and the positive value of his stammer. All this he must learn without checking its progress. When both have grown together and the free and stammering speech are standing side by side, then comes the harvest. It is not an arranged time, it is not the last session of a pre-arranged programme; it is 'when the time is ripe', at the appropriate moment, the miracle happens.

There are in the New Testament many examples of the theme shown by the Parable of the Wheat and the Tares. Christ's whole training of His disciples demonstrates this truth. What foolish men they were and how slow to learn! How could they squabble over the chief seats in His Kingdom after being with Him and hearing Him? Yet He allowed in them both to grow together, the good seed and the weeds. This is shown supremely in St Peter's denial. It was not the first time St Peter had been impetuous when he spoke at the Last Supper. Why did not Jesus root out this fault in St Peter? Because both had to

grow together until St Peter could realize the kind of man he was. His impetuosity was not an evil to be rooted out; it was something which St Peter had to understand for himself, and so only by the suffering of the denial did the time of the harvest come.

In the case of the girl which I have quoted, there was no question of analytic treatment, but this is of course often necessary, and there are many New Testament passages justifying this form of treatment. Perhaps the most obvious statement is: 'Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall set you free.' It is as truth is allowed gradually to shine into the darkness that the stammerer gains power to cast off his shackles. So long as the stammerer cannot understand his stammer he is in the dark, and no matter how great his efforts he will fail because of the darkness. Light must be allowed to shine within and show up what is there. Darkness is dispelled by the light itself. No action is necessary other than letting the light in. This is very important. So often the stammerer, when he has gained some insight, imagines that he can now apply it and use it to stop his stammer; but the action must be that of the light itself, which must be allowed access to those dark gloomy regions of the interior.

I remember reading many years ago an exposition by the Rev. Dr Cyril H. Valentine of St Peter's release from prison. It came to my mind very forcibly when I started treating stammerers. Peter is bound and helpless. Then a light shines and the angel bids him rise, dress, and follow him. Peter obeys, and follows the angel in the darkness through the first and second wards of the prison. That is just what the stammerer must do. He has to walk through the darkness with what little light he has, knowing he is still in prison. When Peter comes to the gate leading out to the city, it is bolted and barred; there seems no hope; but a miracle happens and it opens by itself. So too the stammerer may well feel after some time that he is confronted by a barrier which he cannot move. The miracle can happen and the door open of itself.

I have given some instances of the relevance of New Testament teaching in individual treatment, but I am convinced that group treatment is just as much in keeping with the profound wisdom of the Bible. In the group of perhaps six or eight, the family situation is recapitulated and the old relationships worked through. It is in this group that fellowship may grow and love heal. The discipline of a group is hard; there are always casualties, and it brings the cross of bearing one another's burdens in a very real sense. Perhaps that is why the possibilities of the group as a source of truly Christian healing have not been more fully explored. The healing fellowship, the family in which re-birth may take place, has been very largely lost by the Churches, but its potentialities are being re-discovered by those using group methods of treatment. Over the door of Jung's house there is carved in stone by the owner himself this inscription: '*Vocatus atque non vocatus Deus aderit.*' Those of a group may well deny any religious beliefs, but nevertheless the Spirit is there to heal.

CYRIL N. OGDEN

<sup>1</sup> For what follows about the origin and growth of a stammer I am indebted to Dr Leopold Stein, who has made a special study of the subject, see Stein, 'The Psychosomatic Nature of Stammering' (*Folia Phoniatria*, Vol. V, 1953); *Speech and Voice* (Methuen).

# 'MAD GRIMSHAW' AND HIS COVENANTS WITH GOD

## A Study in Eighteenth-century Psychology

### PART I

ROBERT SOUTHEY, suspicious of anything which could be labelled 'enthusiasm', wrote thus in his *Life of Wesley*:

William Grimshaw, who held the perpetual curacy of Haworth . . . in his unconverted state . . . was certainly insane. . . . He became, however, a very zealous parish priest; and his oddities, which procured him the name of Mad Grimshaw, did not prevent him from being very useful among a set of parishioners who are said to have been as wild as the bleak, barren country which they inhabited.

New evidence is now available to fill out the picture of 'Mad Grimshaw'. Although it is doubtful whether the term 'insane' can strictly be applied to him, there is little doubt that at times his mental stability was in grave danger. His mind was such a battleground that, robust yeoman though he was, he complained of violent headaches, which he dismissed in the words, 'Rheumatic, as I think.'

To aid him in his continual battle with evil, Grimshaw enlisted the aid of what Southey called 'one of the most perilous practices that ever was devised by enthusiasm'. This was the making of a written covenant with God. During the twenty-five years of Grimshaw's life after his religious awakening, he made or renewed such a 'solemn covenant' on at least twenty-four occasions, twice drawing up lengthy legal documents to that end. Constantly one or other of these documents would be renewed 'for the last time' or 'for ever', and almost without fail violated. What indication does this give of Grimshaw's character? Does it prove mental dishonesty or instability—even madness? Or should the explanation be sought in a diseased or hypersensitive conscience, or possibly in the fact that Grimshaw was faced with strong, almost irresistible temptations? Before the answer can be given with any certainty, the background and course of his life must be studied in some detail.

Eyewitness accounts describe William Grimshaw as about 5 feet 10 inches in height, thickset even to corpulence, with a broad barrel of a chest and an immensely strong frame. His face was rather coarse and fleshy, slightly marked with smallpox; he had a large nose, thick, sensual lips; and a double chin. Although inclined to stoutness, however, he had none of the slow complacency that often goes with it. His manuscripts frequently praise the virtues of meditation, but one feels that he had little first-hand knowledge of those virtues. Unless he were busy about something, he felt that he was 'embezzling the Golden Moments'. Writing to John Wesley in 1747, he said: 'I must assure you I have as little leisure for writing as anything I do.' His nature was passionate and impetuous. This, coupled with his great physical strength, made him a figure to be dreaded by the ungodly ruffians of Haworth parish.

From his basic character and early history, Grimshaw seemed marked out to become one of those coarse, bloodshot parsons who were supposed to be typical

of the eighteenth century, their energy and interest exhausted by fishing, hunting, and drinking, until apoplexy should put an end to a 'short life, and a merry one'. As a Cambridge undergraduate he 'learned to drink, and swear, and was as vile as the worst'. Though his entry into Holy Orders in 1731, at the age of twenty-two, sobered him, it was only for a time. During his first two curacies, at Rochdale and Todmorden, he was welcomed to 'county' families as a man of the world who could be relied upon to preach a sound—and harmless—'moral sermon'.

He was extremely fond of practical jokes. On one occasion he rushed straight home from church to hide his landlady's butter, so that when she arrived he was able demurely to help her search for the thief. On another occasion he successfully disguised himself as the Devil in order to frighten a young man into marrying a girl whom he had seduced. This practical joking, which he carried on to the end of his life, reveals another side of his character, his vivid imagination—the imagination of a poet. His preaching was epigrammatic as well as forceful. His manuscripts show that he possessed in large degree the poetic impulse, though it seems never to have been developed.

In keeping with his impulsive disposition was his marriage, at the age of twenty-seven, to a gay young widow who rode up to the door of his lodgings on her palfrey and called out to him, 'I am come to bid a penny at you.' This unconventional wooing led to a marriage which seems to have been a mixture of ecstatic happiness and bitter disillusion. Grimshaw had already had occasional revulsions from the pleasures of the world. He had given up card-playing, hunting, and fishing, and began to catechize and hold prayer-meetings. This was about a year before his marriage. But his reformation was not yet complete, and his unsettled mind kept swinging from delight in pleasure to bitter detestation of it. His marriage both accentuated and epitomized this mental conflict. His recoils from pleasure-loving to pleasure-hating became more vehement. He was passionately in love with his wife, yet found her worldly character a great hindrance to him in his religious moods. So much did this increase his inner tension that later he wrote:

Believers Souls seldom prosper, who marry in the Youth of Grace . . . it is most advisable that GOD's People shou'd abstain from Marriage, 'til they are grown strong & are established in Grace. . . . 'Tis a sore Thing, when in order to stop the Progress of Grace in Young Men and Women, the devil can perswade them to believe they should woo & wed.—Away with such Wedding that has nothing but the devil & flesh & unsuspected lust at the Root of it.

We believe that this largely describes Grimshaw's own experience. He looked upon his marriage as tainted by 'unsuspected lust', and therefore a terrible hindrance to his growth in grace. After two or three years of yielding to his bodily appetites, however, he resolved to give himself over to God, and to deny, if it were possible, all his animal instincts. And so, long before he came into contact with the Methodists, whilst still a curate at Todmorden, whilst his wife was still alive, with a young child, possibly two, in the house, Grimshaw made a solemn dedication of himself to God. This was of much greater importance to him than his ordination vows, for it was not merely a formal ceremony, but the

result of the deeply-felt urgings of his own conscience. Whether or not this dedication was signalized in writing is uncertain, but he refers to it in his 1752 covenant, saying, 'Thou knowest, O Lord, I solemnly covenanted with Thee, in the year 1738.'

The next year, on 1st November, his wife died, a loss which Grimshaw must have contemplated with mixed feelings. He could now pursue the ascetic type of religion to which he felt impelled without either the hindrance or the temptation of his wife's presence. Yet a document drawn up a few weeks after her death, concerning his own burial 'as near her as convenience will permit', shows the deep affection he had for her. At the time, however, his wife's death was dwarfed by a long and severe spiritual struggle, of which the 1738 covenant had been the first real landmark. This struggle was thus described by Joseph Williams of Kidderminster in 1745, reporting a conversation with Grimshaw:

About six years ago it pleased God to bring him under awakening and terrifying convictions. . . . Thereupon, being ignorant of God's righteousness, he went about to establish his own, reformed in every branch and every relation, abstained from every immorality, said many prayers, spent much time in reading and meditation, and that he might leave nothing undone that he possibly could do, he kept two diaries, in one of which, after daily close examination of his heart and ways, he recorded every particular sin he could recollect, then confessed, begged of God pardon, repented, resolved, and prayed for more strength and grace.<sup>1</sup> . . . About this time two of his parishioners attempted to make away with themselves, one by hanging himself, the other by cutting his throat, but the life of each was remarkably preserved. Being sent for to him who had cut his throat, his first thought was, he did not know how soon he might do so too. Fifteen months he lay under a spirit of bondage, wrestling not only against flesh and blood, but against angels, &c., and in his own strength, therefore he gained no advantage over his spiritual enemies. The reformation in his deportment and manner of life was conspicuous. He was cried up for a saint, and even the wife of his bosom could bear him witness, that never was man more changed for the better. But still his heart knew its own bitterness.

Spiritual relief came for Grimshaw whilst still at Todmorden, towards the end of his ministry there, in 1742. Whilst reading Dr Owen on Justification he suddenly realized that Christ could bestow what his own asceticism could not achieve, the revelation sending such a rush of blood to his head that he marvelled at the pewter dishes reflecting such heat from the fire. But it was only a relief, not a cure. The battle with evil within and without was to continue till his life's end.

It was shortly after this experience of temporary spiritual release that Grimshaw came to Haworth, beginning a new life in new surroundings. From the outset of his curacy there he was a man of power, for in discovering Christ he had discovered himself. Yet he never felt wholly delivered from 'the sin which doth so easily beset us' which he took to mean our temperamental failings. He had not long been at Haworth before he felt the need for making another covenant with God, which he did on 8th August 1744, perhaps partly under the stimulating Methodist influence of 'Scotch Will' Darney. This covenant he always connected in his mind with a 'glorious vision from the third heaven', as he called it, which came to him 'at church, and in the clerk's house, between the



hours of ten and two o'clock on Sunday, September 2, 1744'. While conducting the morning service he turned dizzy, and had to be helped from the church, he himself believing that it was a seizure warning him of approaching death. On being carried into the nearby clerk's house (the parsonage then being a long way off, at Sowdens), his arms and legs were 'cold as death'. Massage and hot cloths for over an hour made little difference, and he 'fell into a trance'.

He thought he overheard God the Father holding a conference with the Lord Jesus Christ concerning him, and for a long time it seemed to go very hard against him; for God the Father would not save him because he had not wholly relinquished his own righteousness, to trust solely and entirely in the merits and righteousness of the Lord Jesus Christ, but the Lord Jesus pleaded for him. A long time he was held in suspense, hoping and fearing, for still it seemed to go hard against him. At last he thought he evidently saw the Lord Jesus put down His hands and feet as it were below the ceiling, and he had time enough to see the nail holes in them which he observed to be ragged and blueish, and fresh blood streaming from each of them. Instantly he was filled with a joyful sense of his interest in Christ.

Williams's account of the incident (received from Grimshaw in the very same parlour a few months later) continues that suddenly his arms and legs were warm, and he got up, quite recovered. So well was he, in fact, that according to an eyewitness

In the afternoon he performed service in the church, which began at two o'clock, and preached and spoke so long to the people, that it was seven in the evening before he returned home.

This incident undoubtedly shows the vivid reality—almost the *bodily* reality—of spiritual things to Grimshaw. Satan was as real to him as to the inkpot-flinging Luther. He was moving in a world full of titanic powers, waging spiritual conflict. He was terribly afraid, both for himself and others, either that the Devil would get them completely in his power, or that God would reject them utterly. In 1752 he wrote, in a spirit of grave foreboding:

Upon Saturday, February the first, a little after Nine O'Clock of this Morning, I had it most strongly impressed upon my Mind, that the vial of GOD's Wrath is almost full and that HE will shortly pour it out in some grievous Judgment, or other, upon this Nation, and upon this PARISH in Common with if not more grievously, than, on many other Places of the Land, for the sin and wickedness of it in general; but especially for her contempt & disregard of the Gospel. . . . O that the Gospel Trumpet may continue to sound in our Kingdom! O that the impending Ruin our iniquities will speedily involve us in may thereby & by a speedy Repentance be prevented; but I am too too much perswaded, it will not.—I am almost confident that the present Sinners & Gospel-despisers will be the greatest Sufferers in the Approaching calamitous Judgment, and that therefore the same is not far off. . . .

Feeling himself called as a warrior of God to bring England, or at least Haworth, to its knees, Grimshaw later in that same year of 1752 entered into another solemn pact with God. This was signalized by a very long and impressive document, written 'at large on Parchment'. As it is available in the longer

biographies of Grimshaw, only brief extracts will here be given. It was one of the chief landmarks of his life. After a preamble referring to his own wickedness, and to his former covenants in 1738 and 1744, he continues:

And now, once more, and for ever, I most solemnly give up, devote, and resign all I am, spirit, soul, and body, to Thee, and to Thy pleasure and command, in Christ Jesus, my Saviour, this 4th day of December, 1752: sensible, O Lord, of my vileness and unworthiness, but yet that I am Thy pardoned, justified, and regenerated child, in the Spirit and blood of my dear and precious Saviour, Jesus Christ, by clear experience. . . . Record, O eternal Lord, in Thy book of remembrance, that henceforth I am Thine for ever. From this day I solemnly renounce all former lords, world, flesh and devil, in Thy name. No more, directly, or indirectly, will I obey them. I renounced them many years ago, and I renounce them for ever.

He winds up with a strange legal flourish:

I solemnly subscribe this dedication of myself to the for ever blessed Triune God, in the presence of angels, and all invisible spectators, this fourth day of December, 1752. William Grimshaw.

This impressive document, however, breathing as it does a spirit of deep and awesome piety, was not sufficient to bring lasting peace of mind to its signatory. A year later we can see him through the eyes of the wife of Joseph Jones, a circuit preacher, who stayed for about six months at Haworth Parsonage during an illness:

He was always happy in Christ, and never lost sight of Him from the first day of his conversion; yet no one groaned under the bondage of corruption more than he did; and he frequently said, 'O if the people knew what a heart I have they would not love and honour me as they do.'

His strength to fight temptations needed fortifying by another Covenant less than two years after the most important document of 1752. This time, however, instead of choosing legal and lasting parchment, he wrote on the blank leaf between the Old and New Testaments in his folio Bible, in these words:

Often have I, and once more do I, totally devote—most solemnly surrender *by this sacred Book of God*, and forever give up to God in Christ my Head and Lord, my body, Soul and Spirit—and *all* I am, and have and may be, in the fullest sense of St Paul's exhortation Rom. 12<sup>1, 2</sup>. And I nothing doubt, but that, as I have hitherto found by many years' experience in Christ, that *His* grace is sufficient for me; so I always shall be enabled to do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me. So help me O TRIUNE GOD.

William Grimshaw, Minr: of Haworth, August 4th, 1754.

(To be Concluded)

FRANK BAKER

<sup>1</sup> This reference to two diaries can hardly mean what it says, for in 1755 Grimshaw explicitly states that he begins to keep a diary for the first time. Possibly a book of daily jottings is meant, such as one entitled 'Experiences', which is still preserved, but relating to a later date.

## IRANIAN INFLUENCES ON JEWISH AND CHRISTIAN APOCALYPTIC

IN reading the Old Testament we are disappointed with its teaching about the hereafter. Sheol, the abode of the dead, is described as being composed of dark caves in the depths of the earth (Ps. 86<sub>13</sub>, 143<sub>3</sub>) and its horror is increased by the fact that it is conceived as a land of forgetfulness and silence (Ps. 94<sub>17</sub>). The most serious aspect of that dreadful place, however, is that its inmates are completely separated from Jehovah: 'for in death there is no remembrance of thee: and in the grave who shall give thee thanks?' (Ps. 6<sub>5</sub>).

The Jews, having learned these cheerless ideas about the hereafter, must have all the more readily embraced the inspired teaching of the Iranians. This is the only inference we can make from the vast difference between the eschatology of the Hebrews and of the Jews, and between the teaching of the Old Testament and that of the Jewish apocalyptic writers. The Hebrew writers could offer no more comfort to the dying than the cheerless existence of Sheol; whereas the apocalyptic writers could offer a glorious resurrection coupled with rewards for the righteous and punishment for the wicked.

The Jewish writers who absorbed and developed the Persian teaching were called 'apocalyptists'; for, being no longer interested in this world, they focus their attention on the life after death and endeavour to unveil some of its secrets.

None of the apocalyptic books, with the exception of the Book of Daniel, was included in the Old Testament. But many of these Jewish works have survived, and they have been collected together in a volume by Charles to which he gives the title, *Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*. When these books were written they were widely read by the Jews.

Apocalyptic teaching is characterized by several prominent theological ideas. (1) There is a marked dualism, a continual conflict between God and the devil. (2) God is regarded as remote from the affairs of men—hence there is a belief in superhuman beings who are mediators between God and man. (3) Above all, there is eschatology; these writers vividly describe the resurrection, and along with it they stress the idea of judgement. It is interesting to notice that these ideas form the core of the teaching of the Iranians. As we find no parallel to these doctrines in Hebrew thought, we infer that the Jews borrowed them from the Iranians.

In a short article it is only possible to give a few examples of Iranian influences on Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic. First, let us examine briefly the Iranian conception of the Forces of Evil. These are led by Angra Mainyu (the devil), and they constitute a continuous menace to the Heavenly Host, which is directed by Ahura Mazada (God). In the Avesta, these beings who serve Angra Mainyu are called Daevas (demons).

Angra Mainyu and the Daevas were believed to dwell in darkness. They were always ready to attack any human being who tried to serve Ahurah Mazda. Hence, Zarathustra, his chosen messenger, was a suitable victim for Angra Mainyu's assault:

From the region of the north . . . forth rushed Angra Mainyu, the deadly. . . And thus spake the guileful one: 'Druj rush down upon him; destroy the holy Zarathustra.'

The Druj came rushing along, . . . Zarathustra chanted aloud the Ahuna-Vairya: 'The will of the Lord is the law of holiness.' . . . The Druj dismayed rushed away (Vend. Farg., 19, 1f.).

It comes as a surprise to notice that not only is there a similarity between our Lord's conception of the devil and the Avestan teaching<sup>1</sup> about Angra Mainyu, but there is also a resemblance between our Lord's encounter with the devil and Zarathustra's conflict with the leader of the Legion of Hell.

The great conflict between the Forces of Righteousness and the Powers of Evil will inevitably come to an end with the complete and final triumph of good over evil: 'And when perfection shall have been attained, then shall the blow of destruction fall upon the Demon of Falsehood and her adherents shall perish with her' (Ys. 30, 10). Angra Mainyu, his Daevas, and all who have supported them, will be utterly destroyed:

When the creation will grow deathless . . . and the Druj shall perish, though she may rush on every side to kill the holy beings; she and her hundredfold breed shall perish as it is the will of the Lord' (Yst. Zamyad., 19, 20).

Among the Apocalyptic literature,<sup>2</sup> the Book of Enoch supplies us with a similar conception. The functions and fate of the devil and his followers are similar to those of the forces of evil among the Iranians. Their work is to lead men astray: 'The name of the first Jeqon; that is, the one who led astray all the sons of God' (69<sub>4</sub>). But the time was not far distant when the destroyer, along with his supporters, would be destroyed:

And Michael, and Gabriel, and Raphael, and Phanuel shall take hold of them on that great day, and shall cast them in that day into the burning furnace, that the Lord of spirits may take vengeance on them for their unrighteousness (54<sub>6</sub>).

There is nothing akin to this conception of the devil in the Old Testament; for there all supernatural beings are subject to God (Neh. 9<sub>6</sub>), and Satan, 'the adversary' whose task it is to accuse men (Job 1<sub>6</sub>; Zech. 3<sub>1f</sub>), has not yet developed into the Leader of the Forces of Evil.

It is possible that the belief in angels among the Iranians developed from the conception of six attributes of Ahura Mazda which were personified by Zarathustra, and which were given the name Amesha Spentas:

We worship the good, strong, beneficent . . . bright ones, whose looks perform what they wish, . . . who are undecaying and holy: Who are all seven of one thought, Who are all seven of one speech, Who are all seven of one deed; . . . Whose father and commander is the same, namely, the Maker, Ahura Mazda" (Farv. Yst., 23, 82f.).

In the Book of Zechariah (4<sub>10</sub>), which is regarded as belonging to the apocalyptic literature, we read: 'the seven spirits which are the eyes of the Lord, and which run to and fro throughout the whole earth'. This seems to have been borrowed from the Amesha Spentas of the Avesta. Not only are there seven; but their activities suggest that they have originated from the attributes of Ahura Mazda. When we turn to the Book of Tobit, we find that the reference is clear and unmistakable: 'I am Raphael, one of the seven holy angels, which

present the prayers of the saints, and which go in and out before the glory of the Holy One' (12<sub>15</sub>).

Moreover, mention of the seven angels is found in the Book of Enoch. In Chapter 20 each angel is named and assigned a special task. The order of the names is as follows: Uriel, Raphael, Reguel, Michael, Saraqael, Gabriel, and Remiel. In Enoch 81, the seven are again referred to: 'And those seven holy ones brought me and placed me on the earth before the door of my house.'

The only references in the New Testament to the seven spirits occur in Revelation, 'The seven spirits which are before the throne' (1<sub>4</sub>, 8<sub>2</sub>), and 'the seven spirits of God, and the seven stars' (3<sub>1</sub>). These allusions to seven angels in apocalyptic literature can only be satisfactorily explained by regarding them as having been borrowed by Jewish writers from the Avesta.

In the Avesta the belief in Guardian Angels of communities and nations is taught:

I desire to approach with my praise those Fravashis [guardian spirits] which have existed from of old, the Fravashis of the houses, and of the villages, of the communities, and of the provinces (Ys., 23, 1).

This passage suggests that the Iranians believed that every household and every community had its own Guardian Spirit.

This teaching was taken over by Jewish apocalyptic writers, for whom powerful archangels became the guardians of nations. In Daniel 10<sub>13</sub> we read: 'But the princes of the kingdom of Persia withstood me one and twenty days: but, lo, Michael, one of the chief Princes, came to help me.' It seems clear that this passage refers to the guardian spirits of nations, and that Michael was regarded as being the protector of the Jews. In the Book of Enoch we find a description of the sphere of activity for several angelic beings: 'Uriel, one of the holy angels, who is over the world and over Tartarus' (verse 2), and 'Michael . . . is set over the best part of mankind and over chaos' (verse 5). Moreover, in the Testament of Levi (verse 6) we read of the angel 'who intercedes for the nations of Israel'. In Revelation 12, we learn that Michael and his angels were engaged in warfare in Heaven against the devil.

The Iranians believed that the soul of a dead person remains on the earth plane for the first three days. During this period there is recalled to the soul of the departed his past deeds. To the soul of the righteous this review of the past brings a feeling of joy and a sense of security. On the other hand, the review of the past by the soul of the wicked makes him most unhappy, and fills him with a deep sense of insecurity (Yst. Frag., 22). While undergoing the three days probation, the soul is under the protection of Sraosha: 'O Sraosha, thou blessed one . . . protect us for the lives; yea, for both, for that of this world . . . and for the world of mind against unhappy death' (Ys., 57, 25).

The Book of Baruch<sup>3</sup> teaches that immediately after death the soul of the righteous beholds for seven days the seven ways of righteousness (7, 101). The idea behind this passage, that of a period of probation before judgement, has probably been taken over from Iranian teaching, the difference being that the Mazdean three days of preparation has been altered to seven.

The Iranian Sacred Books maintain that after death the soul of the righteous is protected by an angel, whereas the soul of the wicked is tormented by a devil,



and that finally, the righteous is escorted to heaven and the wicked thrust down into hell. The writer of the Testament of Asher has a similar conception:

For the latter end of men do show their righteousness or unrighteousness when they meet the angel of the Lord, and of Satan. For when the soul departs troubled, it is tormented by the evil spirit . . . But if he is peaceful . . . be meeteth the angel of peace, and he leadeth him into eternal life (2<sub>4-6</sub>).

The conception of the Intermediate State current in the time of our Lord allowed for a distinction between the righteous and the wicked. This difference is shown in Christ's teaching. He tells us that Dives 'in Hades lifted up his eyes, being in torments', while Lazarus 'was carried by the angels to Abraham's bosom' (Luke 16<sub>22f.</sub>). The parable supplies several points which suggest its origin in Iranian sources. The righteous man, who had been escorted to Heaven by angels, is happy; but the wicked man is tormented in Hades. Indeed, the parable itself might conceivably be an elaboration of the following Iranian passage:

I have seen a celebrity with much wealth, whose soul, infamous in the body, was hungry and jaundiced in hell, and he did not seem to me exalted: and I saw a beggar with no wealth and helpless, and his soul was thriving in paradise, and he seemed to me exalted (Bahm Yst., 2, 12).

When our Lord was crucified, the penitent thief was dying on a cross beside Him. The man's earnest cry was: 'Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy Kingdom!' And the reply of Jesus was: 'Today shalt thou be with me in Paradise' (Luke 23<sub>42f.</sub>). The word 'Paradise' is of Persian origin and means 'an enclosure' or 'a park'.

The Iranian teaching about the resurrection is given in great detail in the Bundahish.<sup>4</sup> We are informed that the Saohsyant will appear at the end of the world and raise the dead to life (30, 4). This statement, however, presented a problem. The question was immediately asked as to the nature of the resurrection body. The Iranian could not possibly understand how Ahura Mazda would be able to restore the body which, after being placed in the grave, had completely disintegrated. The writer of the Bundahish answers the question by pointing out that Ahura Mazda had a much more difficult task at creation than he would have in restoring the dead to life (30, 5f.). This is followed by a description of the resurrection. Both the righteous and the wicked will be raised to life (30, 7f.). The resurrection body will not be subject to the limitations of the material body, and this spiritual body will continue to advance from glory to glory for ever (30, 26).

The teaching of the resurrection in the Apocalypse of Baruch is a detailed answer to Baruch's question: 'In what shape will these live in Thy day?' God informs Baruch that the dead will be raised to life, and that everyone will possess the distinguishing characteristics by which his relations and friends will recognize him again (50<sub>2-4</sub>). Afterwards everyone will be transformed to fit him for a spiritual existence (51<sub>3-10</sub>).

The account of the resurrection in the Book of Baruch bears striking resemblances to the narrative of the Bundahish. In each account we find:

1. The question asked about the nature of the resurrection body.
2. The conception of the preservation of something from the physical body which is an essential part of the spiritual body.
3. The new body will be easily recognized by loved ones.
4. The laws which apply to the physical body will no longer have power over the spiritual body, for 'time shall no longer age them'. As the two accounts bring out these points in the same order, we can only infer that the Jewish narrative depends upon the Iranian.

St Paul was faced with the same perplexing problem about the nature of the resurrection body as the writers of the Bundahish and the Apocalypse of Baruch. The Apostle's answer suggests that he used a similar tradition to that employed both by the Iranian and Jewish writers. The current conception of the resurrection among the Jews was that it would be the physical body which would be raised. St Paul rejected this view, and stressed that it would be a spiritual body. In his explanation of the nature of the resurrection, the Apostle introduced his analogy of the sowing of the seed. A seed is sown and some of its material particles perish, but the germ of life remains. The new organism is not identical with the old one, for 'that which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die: and that which thou sowest, thou sowest not the body that shall be, but a bare grain' (1 Cor. 15<sup>36f.</sup>). At this point the Apostle's analogy broke down.

It is possible that St Paul borrowed the metaphor of the seed from Sanhedrin, 90b, which reads: 'The corn of wheat is entrusted naked to the earth, and comes again to life with a multitude of clothing; shall not the pious who are buried in their garments also rise clothed?' In the chapter in the Bundahish which deals with the subject of the resurrection, the growth of a seed is mentioned. Immediately after the question: 'And how does the resurrection occur?' we read: 'Ahura Mazda answered thus . . . "When by me corn was created so that, scattered about the earth, it grew again with increase"' (30, 4f.).

These brief examples taken from the different subjects dealt with by the apocalyptic writers and considered along with similar subjects to which Iranian writers refer leave us to assume that the Jewish writers had been influenced, to a considerable extent, by Iranian ideas. In support of this assumption is the important fact that the Iranian ideas are more undeveloped and more materialistic than the Jewish or Christian teaching.

P. HADFIELD

<sup>1</sup> The collection of Iranian sacred writings is called the Avesta. The Gathas, hymns or psalms, which are believed to have been written by the prophet Zoroaster himself, are regarded as the oldest part of the Avesta. In all probability they were written not later than the seventh century B.C. The Gathas chiefly deal with eschatological subjects. The later books of the Avesta elaborate this teaching, and these are divided into four sections: the Yasna or sacrificial worship, the Vispered or in the book of invocations, the Yashts or worship by laudation, and the Vendidad or law against demons. These later books are believed to have been written between 558 B.C. and 323 B.C.

The Bundahish is a sacred book of the Parsees which was written in the Pahlavi language (an ancient west Iranian idiom). This book is an important source of Mazdean beliefs, because it incorporates ancient ideas, although it was written at a later date than the Avesta.

Translations of the Iranian sacred books have been made by Darmesteter and West in *Sacred Books of the East*, Vols. 4, 23, and 31.

<sup>2</sup> Translations of the Jewish Apocalyptic literature referred to in this article are given by H. R. Charles in *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, 2 Vols.

<sup>3</sup> The teaching on the resurrection in the Apocalypse of Baruch. The question put by Baruch to God: 'In what shape will those live who live in Thy day? . . . Will they then resume this form of the present and put on their entrammelling members . . . or will Thou perchance change

## OLIVER CROMWELL

ON 3RD SEPTEMBER 1658, in the calm that followed the storms of a summer such as the credulous of the twentieth-century would attribute to nuclear tests, 'the most noble and puissant Oliver, Lord Protector of the Commonwealth of England, Scotland, and Ireland, and the dominions and territories thereunto belonging' died. It was the anniversary of two of his great military successes, Dunbar and Worcester, and of one of his political failures, the meeting of his unhappy first Parliament as Protector. His strange and wonderful career can hardly be interpreted without Reinhold Niebuhr's concept of *irony*.

What was the true character of the man whom Macaulay's runaway eloquence describes as being, at the time of Hampden's death 'a rugged and clownish soldier, half fanatic, half buffoon, whose talents, discerned as yet only by one penetrating eye, were equal to all the highest duties of the soldier and the prince'?<sup>1</sup> Richard Baxter, whose pastoral soul abhorred the lay-religion of the Cromwellian armies, speaks for succeeding centuries as well as his own, when he writes: 'Never man was highlier extolled, and never man was baselier reported and vilified than this man.'<sup>2</sup> Baxter's own judgement is that Cromwell 'meant honestly in the main, and was pious and conscionable in the main course of his

these things (viz. physical parts of the body), which have been in the world?' as also the world, (42.3).

And God answers: 'For the earth will then assuredly restore the dead, which it now receives, in order to preserve them, but, as it has received, so will it restore them. For then it will be necessary to show to the living that the dead have come to life again, and that those who have departed have returned. And it shall come to pass, when they have severally recognized those whom they now know, then judgement will grow strong, and those things which before were spoken of will come' (502.4).

This is followed by a description of the transformation which will take place: As for the glory of those who have now been justified in my law . . . then their splendour will be glorified in changes, and the form of their face will be turned into the light of their beauty, that they may be able to acquire and receive the world which does not die. . . . For they will behold the world which is now invisible to them, and they will behold the time which is now hidden from them. And again time will not age them . . . and they shall be made like unto the angels, and be made equal to the stars, and they shall be changed into every form they desire, from beauty into loveliness, and from light into splendour of glory' (513, 8, 10).

<sup>4</sup> The Iranian conception of the resurrection as given in the Bundahish. The question is put by the writer to Ahura Mazda: 'What will be the nature of the resurrection body?' (30, 5).

And Ahura Mazda answers: 'When by me a son was created and fashioned in the womb of a mother, and the structure severally of the skin, nails, blood, feet, eyes, ears, and other things was produced . . . each of them, when created by me was herein more difficult than causing the resurrection, for it is an assistance to me in the resurrection that they exist. . . . Observe, that when that which was not was then produced, why is it not possible to produce again that which was? For at that time one will demand the bone from the spirit of the earth, the blood from water, the hair from the plants, and life from fire' (30, 5-6).

Having answered this question, the writer describes the resurrection itself: ' . . . every human creature, they raise up from the spot where its life departs. Afterwards when all the material beings assume again their bodies and forms, then they assign them a single class. Then will take place the great assembly where the good and the evil actions of each man will be made visible. . . . The righteous man who has neglected to check his friend who acted sinfully, will reap great shame for his negligence. Afterwards they set the righteous apart from the wicked. . . . [The] Saoshyant, and his assistants . . . give every man the reward and recompense suitable to his deeds; this is even the righteous existence where it is said that they convey him to paradise . . . [where] he continually advances for ever and ever (30, 7-8, 11-12, 27.)

life till prosperity and success corrupted him', but this may rest on a temperamental inability to understand Cromwell's designs. For long after the Restoration, Oliver found few to challenge Clarendon's famous verdict that he was 'a brave, bad man'. Walter Scott in *Woodstock* made a real attempt to come to grips with his baffling character, but Cromwell's real rehabilitation was the work of Carlyle. Since then serious historians have tried to do him justice, though there is still a suspicion that he was the prototype of our modern dictators.<sup>3</sup>

Cromwell was a heavy, red-faced 'gentleman farmer' of choleric disposition with a touch of the Welsh in his blood, a lover of field-sports and horse-play. But the outstanding quality, which to those around him obliterated all but the memory of his sometimes mighty rages, was the 'wondrous softness of his heart'. John Maidston, his steward, as well as the more intimate members of his household with whom was his chief joy, would applaud the tribute Andrew Marvell wrote after some years of close association—

*His tenderness extended unto all.  
And that deep soul through every channel flows  
Where kindly Nature loves itself to lose.  
More strong affections never reason served.*

Cromwell's whole life was dominated by his faith. The most significant fact about him is that whether we like him or not, we shall have to go back beyond the Norman Conquest or forward as far as Gladstone to find so religious a ruler. He was a dedicated spirit, devoid of self-seeking, upon whom the highest office was thrust, so it seemed, not by his own consuming ambition, but by the mysterious dispensations of an overruling Providence. History can hardly parallel a soldier-statesman of such amazing selflessness.

Cromwell was educated in the Cambridge which was the intellectual home of Puritanism, and although his conversion seems to have taken place when he was a young married man, he interpreted his religious experience in those numinous Calvinistic terms which Macaulay uses with such power:

He had been wrested by no common deliverer from the grasp of no common foe. He had been ransomed by the sweat of no vulgar agony, by the blood of no earthly sacrifice. It was for him that the sun had been darkened, that the rocks had been rent, that the dead had risen, that all nature had shuddered at the sufferings of her expiring God!<sup>4</sup>

The verifiable record of Cromwell's private deeds is sullied by no sordid misdemeanour, but like many another he could write: 'You know what my manner of life hath been. Oh! I lived in and loved darkness and hated the light. I was a chief, the chief of sinners.'<sup>5</sup> From this time his letters and public pronouncements alike were saturated with the phrases of the Bible in a manner which an irreligious age finds hypocritical, but which faithfully represented the desires of his heart and the aims of his policies.<sup>6</sup> He achieved no easy assurance of his standing in Grace, and he knew the Puritan dark night of the soul, but both his victories in battle and the confusion of the country seemed a Divine summons, though he obeyed it with no egoistic presumption.

The manner of Cromwell's conversion allied to the deep tenderness of his

nature accounts for his attitude to the religious settlement of the nation. His knowledge of God was not mediated by the ordered life of the English Church. No man's conversion is an altogether solitary affair, and Cromwell owed much, we might presume to say everything, to Christian fellowship and doctrine. But it was the company of believers not the hierarchical institution which conveyed to him both converting and confirming grace. He took up arms not so much against political tyranny as against an ecclesiastical system which would have made all men conform to ways which for him had not led to salvation. He was never so fearful as were most of his fellow Puritans of the chaos resulting from religious liberty. There are grounds for thinking that his armies in the Civil Wars were gathered churches. He demanded 'men of spirit', which meant not brute courage but religious fervour, disciplined by moral integrity. Other than this he refused to apply a religious test, and had a sharp answer for those who claimed that his troops were 'a company of Brownists, Anabaptists, Fictious, inferiour persons &c'—

Sir, the State, in choosing men to serve them, takes no notice of their opinions, if they be willing faithfully to serve them, that satisfies. I advised you formerly to bear with men of different minds from yourself; if you had done it when I advised you to it, I think you would not have had so many stumblingblocks in your way. . . . Take heed of being sharp, or too easily sharpened by others, against those to whom you can object little but that they square not with you in every opinion concerning matters of religion.<sup>7</sup>

During the Putney debates of 1648 Cromwell advocated 'toleration and recognition of differences, based on the belief that God may speak through any member of the community, combined with insistence that individual views shall submit to the criticism of open discussion'.<sup>8</sup> He himself never seems to have resented the pointing out of his faults. At this stage he was negotiating with the King, and would have supported a constitutional monarchy. 'I think that the King is king by contract, and I shall say, as Christ said, "Let him that is without sin cast the first stone"'.<sup>9</sup> Cromwell was not 'wedded and glued to forms of government'; scripture, after all, revealed the Jews as equally happy under kings, judges or heads of families. Later, in 1652, when considering the scheme for a religious settlement proposed by John Owen, he said that 'he had rather that Mahometanism were permitted among us than that one of God's children should be persecuted'.<sup>10</sup> It was Cromwell's persistence against a reluctant Council which made possible the return of the Jews in 1656. Only two Roman Catholics were hanged between 1649 and 1660, and one of these Cromwell would have spared. He would have limited capital punishment. One reason why he was tempted to accept the crown was that he might thus exercise the royal prerogative and pardon James Nayler, the unhappy Quaker who was tortured so barbarously for his enthusiastic excesses. Prayer Book Worship was more often connived at during the Protectorate than is popularly supposed.<sup>11</sup>

Against this record of unprecedented enlightenment how are we to assess those deeds which darken Cromwell's name? Here in truth is irony. Consider the killing of the King. Charles I and Cromwell were as Christian as any two men who have confronted each other in English history. Yet in this world reconciliation between them seemed impossible, though it must be said that at



the end of the first Civil War, Cromwell desired it much more sincerely than the King. Charles was one of those high-principled weaklings in whom obstinacy replaces strength, and subterfuge statesmanship. His cruel death, borne with immaculate dignity and unflinching faith, transfigures him. Many of his contemporaries regarded it as sacrilege. But if the elemental revulsion at the killing of an anointed King be ignored—and with Charles I it is not easy to ignore it—there remains the question of alternatives. G. M. Trevelyan, who considers the regicide the worst possible solution and 'a terrible mistake', admits that the problem of what to do with Charles was insoluble. And he declares that had it not been for the absolute defeat of the royal absolutism—

England would have forgotten Magna Carta and Edward Coke's black letter liberties, and become spiritually an apanage of continental Europe. We should not have had our peculiarly English and Conservative Revolution of 1688, but haply have been long afterwards whelmed in some European convulsion more like that of 1789.<sup>12</sup>

Maurice Ashley, dazzled by no mystique of Kingship, regards Charles's death as the prerequisite of secure Parliamentary Government and Constitutional Monarchy.

One need only contrast the history of neighbouring France, where the monarchy of King Louis XIV crushed an incipient parliamentary movement and where a Bourbon King did not mount the scaffold until nearly a century and a half later, to appreciate the full meaning of the trial and execution of King Charles I.<sup>13</sup>

Our particular concern is Cromwell's own attitude to this extreme remedy. He hesitated long, prayed long, and became at last convinced that were the deed not done his would be the greater sin. Once determined he never faltered, and although there is the story, probably apocryphal, of his gazing at the mangled corpse and murmuring 'cruel necessity!', he expressed no penitence at any time during the last years of his life. Was this religious fanaticism at its worst, an apocalyptic aberration, as Trevelyan and John Buchan think,<sup>14</sup> or the resolution of a Christian who will not escape his involvement in the relativities of politics?

The Drogheda and Wexford massacres during the Irish Campaign of 1649-50, when both garrisons were refused quarter, are the notorious exceptions to Cromwell's clemency in war. Dr Robert Paul has discussed the moral issues. At this time at any rate Cromwell does seem to have been seized both of a passionate hatred of Irish Roman Catholicism, and of a conviction that the Old Testament justified a 'suspension of ethics' in dealing with the enemies of God's people.<sup>15</sup> But the supreme irony is that Cromwell uses arguments from expediency which, as modern authors are quick to point out, can be exactly paralleled in the reasons given by the Allies for the atomic annihilation of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.<sup>16</sup>

When we come to consider the confused political events of the 1650s, and the charge that Cromwell was, after all, a military dictator, we must do full justice to the complexities of the situation. The immediate consequence of the regicide was that England had to devise a new constitution. Throughout the years Cromwell was beset by the 'saints' who wished for 'reformation without tarrying' and would have overthrown all good order, and the Presbyterians who

would have proscribed all who would not accept their system. Cromwell's Parliaments were much less tolerant than he himself; they were also more concerned with establishing their own supremacy than with the work of government. Meanwhile, the Royalist cause was as a smouldering bonfire that ever and anon burst into the flames of open revolt, and foreign affairs would not wait on domestic arguments. Small wonder that at times Cromwell's temper broke bounds. But he used wrathful invective backed by the sword to dissolve recalcitrant groups, not to persecute them (Charles I's opponents had fared much worse in the Star Chamber and the pillory), and he never wavered in his adhesion to the general doctrine of liberty of conscience. The irony is that it was this which compelled his own personal rule.

In foreign policy Cromwell acted in accordance with those sentiments of righteous patriotic Protestantism which have still been operative in the wars of our own century, and have alone made it possible for Christians to participate in them. We read of his resolute intercession for persecuted Protestants in Piedmont and in Nîmes with pride, and then we realize that no longer can Britain intervene in the defence of the oppressed, and that God does not seem now to reveal his purposes first to his Englishmen.

The danger is lest we replace Cromwell's seventeenth-century faith by a passionless and cynical agnosticism which lacks both Cromwell's anger and his mercy, and transposes the liberty of the Spirit into libertine desuetude. Oliver's statue outside the Palace of Westminster shows him holding in his hands a Bible and a sword. The Christian should today find the Bible a no less powerful weapon because better understood, but the sword he can only carry as a Cross; for that is his true principle of action, his interpretation of the mysterious ways of the Divine Providence, and his own hope of mercy when this passing world is done.

GORDON S. WAKEFIELD

<sup>1</sup> Lord Macaulay, *Critical and Historical Essays* (ed. F. C. Montague, London, 1903), I.451.

<sup>2</sup> *Autobiography of Richard Baxter* (ed. J. M. Lloyd-Thomas, London 1931), p.85.

<sup>3</sup> Mr Gilbert Harding was seen to repeat this charge in a recent BBC television programme. It is also Sir Winston Churchill's assessment in *History of the English-speaking Peoples*, II, though this section is said to have been written in the late 1930s. Maurice Ashley, in *The Greatness of Oliver Cromwell* (1957), makes handsome amends for the misjudgements of his Cromwell, *The Conservative Dictator* (London, 1937).

<sup>4</sup> Lord Macaulay, *Critical and Historical Essays*, I.50.

<sup>5</sup> *Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell*, ed. W. C. Abbott (Harvard, 1937-47), I.97.

<sup>6</sup> See Robert S. Paul, *The Lord Protector* (London, 1955), pp.34ff., and pp.399f., for some comments on the change in Cromwell's manner of expression after his conversion.

<sup>7</sup> *Writings and Speeches*, I.278. <sup>8</sup> A. D. Lindsay, *Essentials of Democracy*, p.36.

<sup>9</sup> Quoted by M. Ashley, *The Greatness of Oliver Cromwell*, p.192.

<sup>10</sup> Quoted by G. F. Nuttall, *The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience*, p.127.

<sup>11</sup> See Nuttall, op. cit., pp.128-30; Maurice Ashley, *The Greatness of Oliver Cromwell*, pp.287-8.

<sup>12</sup> G. M. Trevelyan, *An Autobiography and Other Essays* (London, 1949), p.174.

<sup>13</sup> Maurice Ashley, *The Greatness of Oliver Cromwell*, p.367.

<sup>14</sup> John Buchan, *Oliver Cromwell* (London, 1934). <sup>15</sup> *The Lord Protector*, pp.207ff.

<sup>16</sup> R. S. Paul, op. cit., p.218; Maurice Ashley, *The Greatness of Oliver Cromwell*, p.231.

## Recent Literature

EDITED BY R. NEWTON FLEW

*Man's Western Quest*, by Denis de Rougemont. (Allen & Unwin, 15s.)

*Society, Evolution and Revelation*, by Jonathan Hanaghan. (Runa Press, Dublin, 21s.)

These writers have a common concern; the present state of Europe and its problematical future. By different routes they arrive at much the same conclusions. To read their books consecutively is highly illuminating. M. de Rougemont's earlier chapters are not easy reading but perseverance brings its reward. Comparing the Eastern and Western worlds he notes 'the historical and spiritual existence of two different experiences'. In general, the East is concerned with the spiritual, seeking escape from the bondage of the flesh (matter) by absorption into the ALL. The West, on the other hand, whilst not neglectful of the spiritual, is intimately concerned with matter and it is significant that the Christian world (Europe) believes that God revealed Himself in material form in the Incarnation. The writer discusses the important word *persona* and shows how Christianity took all that was best in the Greek and Roman conceptions and contributed its own, thus raising the individual to a position of dignity and freedom. The early Church Councils, particularly that of Nicaea, helped to clarify the meaning of the word through their conclusions about the nature of the three Persons of the Trinity. Here is one glaring contrast between Communism and Christianity. Communism says 'Party'. 'It dictates to each what he should do. . . . It liquidates, centralizes and tyrannizes.' On the other hand, Christianity says 'Church', which, in spite of aberrations in the past, means respect for personality. 'It summons to liberty in the obedience of faith.' The European interest in matter originated the physical sciences, an almost wholly Western achievement. Very interesting is the author's account of the road trodden to modern technology and inventions. He concludes that there is no solution of our present difficulties save the general acceptance of Christianity, a term to which he gives a wide content. This brief notice of the book is painfully inadequate, owing to lack of space, but we heartily commend it to thoughtful people, to whom both Past and Present are significant for the future of mankind.

Mr. Hanaghan is a psychologist of wide experience, with penetrating knowledge and original views of his subject. He is a fervent disciple of Freud, but by no means uncritical of him. When he differs it is mainly by amplification of Freud's views rather than by contradictory ones. His book is the outcome of conversations with a group which included Christians, Jews, Buddhists, Moslems, Confucianists, agnostics, and atheists, and the author, in addition to Freud, used 'the teaching of Jesus' and 'a warm vivid, spiritual fellowship resulted'. There are eight divisions to the book, interrelated and yet each complete in itself. The writer deals with Evolution and the Fall of Man, seeing all Creation, animate and inanimate, as 'fallen' and in need of redemption. 'Evolution needs Revelation, for Man and Creation are spirit as well as body-mind. Body-mind belongs to Evolution; spirit does not. Because of this duality Man and Nature need Jesus of Nazareth.' As against Freud he argues for a 'spirit' in man that has potential power over the body-mind. So he goes on to treat of man's need for life in a 'beloved Community'; of the tragedy of European civilization, which evokes a powerful indictment of war and military training, in their psychological effects on the participants; of the limits of Science; and of Creative Love as the solution of our problems. He also works out a psychological basis for religious experience. This is a valuable book, especially for the Christian preacher. Probably few will agree with every theory advanced by the author, but that should not detract from the value of

his work. A book which is merely a recapitulation of ideas previously entertained by the reader and which opens up no new line of thought, is not, for him, of the highest value. An index and a glossary of technical psychological terms would have been helpful to the general reader.

W. L. DOUGHTY

*Late Mediaeval Mysticism*, edited by R. C. Petry (Library of Christian Classics, Vol. 13). (S.C.M., 35s.)

This latest volume in a notable series contains extracts from mystical writers, beginning with St Bernard and ending with St Catherine of Genoa, thirteen chapters in all. Each chapter has an account of the author or authors, a short bibliographical note, and an outline of the author's thought, before coming to the extracts themselves. It is a most useful arrangement and the volume is an excellent book of reference. The editor has added a long general introduction, which includes what he calls the 'setting' for late medieval mysticism with notes on writers from Plato through Dionysius the Areopagite to St Bernard. Strangely enough the note on Plato makes no reference to the *Timaeus*, which was in the Middle Ages a popular source of mystical speculation, if not of mysticism. Moreover, one wonders at the presence of Aristotle in this company. The selections are on the whole well chosen and they illustrate the wide range of mystical thought. France is represented by Bernard and the Victorines, Italy by Francis, Bonaventura, Catherine of Siena and Catherine of Genoa, Spain by Ramon Lull, Germany by Eckhart and the *Theologia Germanica*, England by Rolle, Switzerland by Suso. Tauler, however, though referred to a good many times (not all of them indexed), is left out of the series. So too are the English mystics Julian of Norwich and Margery Kempe. Julian, indeed, is a better example of mysticism in the sense of religious experience than many of those with whom, in Dr Petry's words, 'the role of knowledge is accented'. The term 'mysticism' covers a variety of experiences, not all of them of the same kind. As applied to St Bernard, it is not very different from what we should nowadays call 'evangelicalism', and Abbot Butler's book on Western mysticism, freely quoted by Dr Petry, bears that out. On the other hand, Eckhart is surely to be classed rather with modern speculative writers on theosophy and anthroposophy. Bernard after all was concerned with religious experience, and he realized that contemplation needed to issue in action if the experience was to be healthy. He had many successors, whose works are referred to in this volume, and of whom the unknown author of the *Theologia Germanica* was perhaps the most notable. Eckhart's career is interesting from the fact that he came after Aquinas had given a more or less permanent form to Catholic theology. Hereafter speculation could be given freedom only if it clothed itself in mystical language. But even then, while the Pseudo-Dionysius might get through the iron curtain of orthodoxy because he wrote a long time ago, probably in the sixth century, Eckhart, whose speculations were not dissimilar, ran the risk of heresy, and indeed in the year after his death had a number of his propositions condemned by the Pope. There is a certain pathetic quality about all medieval mysticism. It is full of fancies that break through language and escape. Consequently, in order to express its meaning, it falls back on continual ingenious and often unnecessary subdivisions. Bernard has twelve degrees of pride and humility, Ruysbroeck has three unities—the corporeal, the spiritual and the sublime. Hugh of St Victor refers to three grades of knowledge, one of which—contemplation—is of two kinds. According to Eckhart, there were three reasons why Mary sat at the Master's feet, and three why Martha served Him. Richard Rolle classifies his religious experience under the headings of warmth, music, and sweetness, of which last there are also two kinds. Constant familiarity with his authors has somewhat affected the editor's own style! It is only by close attention that we discover what he means when he writes, for instance, that 'the ascetic workshop throughout our period is, more often

than not, the atelier of the regulars—the monastic laboratory in which ascetism is ordered to the purpose of self-renunciation', or that 'the summit of [Eckhart's] mystical philosophy is to be found in that rootage of divine being which is its priority or unity rather than its essence'. This in itself is the language of mysticism. A. VICTOR MURRAY

*History of Methodist Missions: the Methodist Episcopal Church, 1845-1939: Volume III*, by Wade Crawford Barclay. (Board of Missions of the Methodist Church, via Epworth Bookshop, \$4.50.)

Great as has been the outreach of Methodist overseas missions from the British Isles, it is well to be reminded that the outreach of Methodism in the United States has been vastly greater. Whether it is greater in proportion to the relative size of the two Churches no one should try to say, but it is certainly impressive in the highest possible sense. This third volume of the authoritative history of Methodist missions (that is, the missions of the Methodist Episcopal Church of the U.S.A.) makes this fact abundantly clear. Dr Barclay has mastered an immense wealth of material and presented it lucidly, vigorously and comprehensively; he never allows his reader to be bowed down by the weight of facts which he himself has had to carry. The introductory chapters are especially revealing to a British reader. They show with great candour that America's industrial revolution brought the same evils in its train as its English predecessor—slums, child labour, and the rest, with perhaps a higher degree of corruption in business and political circles—and they introduce us at the same time to that idealistic imperialism which has not yet died out, and which the Americans christened, with unconscious irony, 'Manifest Destiny'. With the changes in the American social structure went hand in hand changes in Methodism. Differentials crept into ministerial allowances, training became more academic, Local Preachers diminished in numbers—and one day the Methodist Church woke up to find itself middle-class from top to bottom. Yet as the Methodists became less and less a 'peculiar people' in their own country, the missionary impulse gained greater and greater momentum, sending evangelists first of all to the American Indians and to the new states of the Middle West, and then across the oceans to Asia, South America, Africa, and continental Europe. The difficulties varied from country to country. In China the missionaries were unwelcome because of the long exploitation of Chinese backwardness by the British, and because of China's own age-long conservatism. The Japanese wanted Western industry and Western economics, but not Western religion. Those sent to the South American republics did not receive the same home support as those who went to the more glamorous countries of the Far East. In Mexico every issue was horribly complicated by politics. Only in Korea and among the out-castes of North India was progress at all rapid. Yet in every country dogged devotion and heroic enterprise planted the Church at last. Across very many of these pages stands the dynamic figure of William Taylor, who worked successively in India, South America, and Liberia, often in virtual independence of his sending Church, but finally recognized as the missionary statesman with the largest vision of them all. Above all, he believed in 'self-support'—that the Churches overseas must stand on their own feet and not rely on subvention, either in money or men, from another continent. Often he put this idea prematurely into effect, and his failures were at least as spectacular as his successes; but mighty inspiration came from both. Everything that anyone could possibly want to know about the subject is in this book—names, ages, countries, towns, villages, assessments of character, figures of converts, strategy, tactics, and exciting narrative. It will probably be used mainly as a book of reference; but there is no reason, except time, for not sitting down and reading it from end to end.

RUPERT E. DAVIES



*Port-Royal*, by Jean Orcibal. (Desclée de Brouwer, Fr. 75.)

The history of Port-Royal is but vaguely known to many in this country. We meet its influence in Racine and Pascal, as part of the Grand Siècle. Preoccupied with Wittenberg and Geneva, we dismiss it theologically as Calvinism within the Roman Church. M. Orcibal has written extensively about Jansenism. The present work is very readable, but slight. The author focuses the crisis of Port-Royal in 1664 by examining the clash of two personalities who represent opposing parties. Angélique de St-Jean became mistress of the novices about the same time as Flavie Passart became mistress of the pensionnaires. Angélique belonged to the fabulous family of Arnauld, and was niece of the reforming Abbess Agnes. An intellectual, devoted to the truth, she refused to submit to the Church. Her only fear was fear of doubt and of failure. 'For to confess our name is, as it were, to confess the name of God.' Flavie Passart, of humbler origin, received into Port-Royal by charity, found a favoured place in the community, and then in the crisis submitted. Angélique accuses her of perfidy and ambition. Flavie dies a public scandal; Angélique becomes Abbess of Port-Royal-des-Champs. M. Orcibal sees Angélique as a 'passionnée', Flavie as a hysteric. Her inferiority complex made her miracles necessary and possible. Surely the theology of this experience is more important than its psychology. Psychology does give us new perspectives, but the Fruits of the Spirit remain a reality. Theologically, this analysis takes inadequate account of Grace. Humanly, Flavie's popularity remains a mystery. The clash is dramatic, but Henry de Montherlant showed that in 1954. If this is the 'Introduction to Port-Royal' promised in *Louis XIV et les Protestants*, then too much knowledge is assumed, and the jostling of unexplained names is baffling.

C. HUGHES SMITH

*Melanchthon, The Quiet Reformer*, by Clyde L. Manschreck (Abingdon Press via Epworth Bookshop, \$6.)

By comparison with Luther and Calvin, Philip Melanchthon must no doubt be placed in the second rank of the reformers; but, as Dr Manschreck portrays him in this biography, there is certainly nothing second-rate about him. As a man, a scholar, and a Christian, he will bear comparison with any of his contemporaries. He and Luther became firm friends and collaborators almost from the first moment of his arrival in Wittenberg, where at the age of twenty-one he was appointed Professor of Greek. He sought to combine the best of renaissance scholarship with evangelical faith in Christ, and on that basis he carried out an immense programme of teaching, writing, educational reform, and ecumenical endeavour. He has often been described as timid, vacillating, and all too prone to compromise for the sake of peace; but Dr Manschreck has little difficulty in showing that such a description is wholly unjust. He was indeed a 'quiet' reformer—the adjective is most aptly chosen—but he was as courageous as any in standing for the truth as he saw it. He was, however, less inclined than some to equate his own grasp and expression of the truth with the truth itself, and therefore the more able to give fellow Christians the benefit of the doubt, if by doing so he could hope to further the cause of Christian unity. He himself received no such consideration from the so-called 'Gnesio' or 'Genuine' Lutherans, who shortly after Luther's death accused him of having departed from Luther's teaching, and whose modern successors speak of a 'Melanchthonian blight' that corrupted Lutheran theology and must be held responsible for most of the defects of subsequent Lutheranism. This seems odd when we recall that the friendship between Luther and Melanchthon was not even slightly strained by the latter's divergences in doctrine, and that Luther, who can hardly have been unaware of them, never ceased to recommend the *Loci Communes* as a theological text-book alongside the Bible. Dr Manschreck is less successful in dealing with this problem than with that of Melanchthon's character, and

he dismisses the Gnesio-lutheran charges rather too easily. (He is a better biographer than theologian; otherwise he could hardly have referred to Luther's eucharistic doctrine as 'semi-transubstantiation'!) But this is a minor defect in a most admirable piece of work. The book is beautifully produced, attractively illustrated, and written with an ease and grace of style that conceal a wealth of scholarly research. The author, who is now Associate Professor of Religion at Duke University, has been an apt pupil of Professor R. H. Bainton, of Yale, beside whose biography of Luther this of Melancthon well deserves to stand.

PHILIP S. WATSON

*The Doctrine of the Buddha: The Religion of Reason*, by George Grimm. (Allen & Unwin, 42s.)

Eastern philosophy has always held firmly to a truth which Western philosophy has rarely grasped tightly and has recently been casting far away—that the basic task of philosophy is to seek answers to the great questions of life and destiny and to issue in soul-cultivation. Only on this basis is philosophy ultimately less trivial than logic, mathematics, science, or chess. That is one reason why Eastern philosophy should be studied by Westerners: it deals with our accustomed problems, but in fuller relation to life. This is especially true of the Buddha; more explicitly than any other Indian thinker, he confined his teachings to matter which he held to have relevance to the peace of the souls of men. Moreover, his mingled austerity and love, earnestness and gentleness, make him one of the most gracious and attractive figures in the history of religion. George Grimm's massive work (a reissue of one published thirty-two years ago) is a clear and comprehensive introduction to Buddhist teaching, written with a conviction as burning as the Buddha's own, that therein is the Way of Salvation. The practicality and clarity of both the Buddha's mind and Mr Grimm's combine to show very plainly where the starting-point of that Way is, and in so doing to reveal its mingled truth and falsity: it is the realization of insufficiency and suffering involved in all attachment to transient things. That is indeed the starting-point of all true spirituality; and the Christian will agree that 'where thy treasure is, there will thy heart be also', that coarse pleasures are always snares and even high values may be such, and that even the noblest that we apprehend as temporal may be transvalued in God's Eternity. But the Christian claims that our highest values are somehow of the nature of God, and that man's apprehension of them may be blameless, perhaps obligatory, even sacramental. Buddhism on the other hand maintains that all human values whatsoever must necessarily cause more suffering than satisfaction; to prove this, it appeals to many true experiences of life, but with breath-taking generalizations and (at least in Mr Grimm's exposition: pp. 41-6, 88-9, 426-32) some sophistry. From this fundamental divergence—between what we may call the 'optimism' of Christianity and the 'pessimism' of Buddhism, though both terms are disputed and do indeed need to be understood with qualifications—continues the whole divergence of their creeds and ways of life. Christianity, admitting values, can accept will in man and God, thus giving man a continuing though transfigurable personality, and God a real though 'analogous' Personality. Buddhism, denying values and hence the desirability of will, is left with no will or values for God, that is, with no God at all; and for man it can only point a way to the cessation of will, in a nothingness which tries also to be called a blessedness, for some selves which till then are only unintelligible groups of willings which have to find misery after misery in body after body. Because of the Buddha's fine practicality and insight and love, the pilgrimages of the two religions, though never together except at their starting-point, do keep largely parallel and within sight of one another; hence the Buddha's experience with such matters as attachment, self-control, enlightenment, can give the Christian much light. But Mr Grimm does not help the Christian towards this as much as he might, for his book

somehow conveys little (except in the quotations) of the radiance and charm of the Buddha's spirit, and instead gives a spiky system. True, Buddhism, even early Buddhism, is highly rationalistic, but rarely, and certainly not in the Buddha himself, in this ungracious way. It is not helpful to see much great Christian thinking on such matters as faith, heaven, hell, beauty, dismissed with sneers at some popular notions on them. Regarded purely as what it claims to be, an exposition of original (i.e. the Buddha's) Buddhism, this book should be approached with caution. The author explains his method in his Preface: after an excellent statement of the difficulties of finding out what a teacher actually said from documents written four hundred years later (pp. xv-xxii), he gives his own criterion—which amounts to holding that what the Buddha taught is what Mr Grimm can fit into a watertight system (pp. xxii-xxiv). Heaven save any thinker from such a defence against his Scholastics! J. F. BUTLER

*Du Catholicisme Romain*, by R. Mehl; *La Théologie de l'Histoire chez Reinhold Niebuhr*, by G. P. Vignaux. (Delachaux & Niestlé, Fr. 4.70 and Fr. 8.50.)

Of these two books perhaps the first, though shorter, will be of the greater interest to English readers. The struggles of French Protestantism for existence give its views on the Roman Church special importance, and though Lutheranism has been stronger and more protected in Alsace (Professor Mehl is at Strasbourg), yet it shares something of the Huguenot outlook. The 'permanent dialogue' between Catholics and Protestants is called here the most characteristic fact of the present ecclesiastical situation. This dialogue is no longer the polemic of the Reformation; on both sides tempers have calmed down and persecutions ended (except in Spain and Colombia). The Roman Church recognizes the existence of other Christian confessions, though regarding Orthodox, Anglicans, 'Protestants', and sects in different ways. So must Protestants recognize that the Roman Church brings men the knowledge of Christ as Saviour. Having begun in this conciliatory fashion, Mehl goes on to examine in forthright manner some of the main differences between Roman Catholic and Protestant. He avoids no thorny issue, glosses over no fundamental difference, and arrives at no easy conclusion. He deals with five main points: Scripture and tradition, the Church as a power, the primacy of Peter, faith and works, and the significance of Mariology. A close analogy is made between Roman Catholicism and the early Judeo-Christians. Both sought to support faith in God on a system of meritorious works and traditions, so veiling 'the pure Gospel'. Perhaps the Barthianism and revived Calvinism of the Continent make Mehl over-emphatic on this. But he does not deny the efforts made in the Roman Church to enliven faith and bring the liturgy closer to the laity. But the possibility of better understanding with Rome is made harder by the development of Mariology, perhaps a sign of the way in which separation has driven both sides to extremes. When the Council of Chalcedon called Mary Theotokos, it was with the aim of ensuring faith in the birth of both divine and human natures in Christ. But the ensuing centuries developed the teaching of Mary as superior to all creatures, even angels, and inferior only to God Himself. Now she is called Spouse of God, Spouse of Christ, and Queen of Heaven. The new dogmas of the Immaculate Conception and the Assumption in effect remove Mary from the human condition that needs justification by faith. And there is hardly any pretence in the papal declarations to find Scriptural basis for the new dogmas; they are needed by the Church—an argument of convenience. The Catholic-Protestant debate today crystallizes round the problem of Mariology. This in its turn depends on the doctrine of the authority of the Pope. The outlook for full reunion of all Christendom is not bright. Nevertheless, there are hopeful signs in deeper and more fraternal concern for one another shown on both sides in the debate.

Miss Vignaux's study of the teaching of Niebuhr is a doctoral thesis presented to the faculty of arts in Strasbourg University. With the many works in English by Niebuhr himself and about him, the main themes will be familiar to many readers. The thesis brings out the importance of Niebuhr's rejection of a philosophy of history and affirmation of a theology of history. Dr Vignaux shows the decisive role played in Niebuhr's development by his ministerial experiences in Detroit, and his resulting judgements on society, democracy, and politics. His stress on the problem of evil, leading to a deeper understanding of Christ and the cross, is well brought out. Niebuhr's theology of history is shown to be exemplary in its contemporary relevance and its interpretation of the faith for today.

E. G. PARRINDER

---

## *From My New Shelf*

BY R. NEWTON FLEW

*For Faith and Freedom*, by Leonard Hodgson; the Gifford Lectures, 1955-7. Vol. II, *Christian Theology*. Basil Blackwell (Oxford. 25s.). This second volume can be described as fulfilling the author's guiding principle. He has made this volume stand by itself, as an intelligible whole. He begins with Bible-reading and Biblical theology; he proceeds to Hocking's definition of religion as "A conversation of the self with reality as an assertion of kinship with the controlling energies of the world," and then to this from Dr Clement Webb: 'It is I think, true from the start, that what men have sought in religion is always communication with that which is supposed or suspected to possess within itself the secret of our life and of our surroundings, and therefore to exert over us and them a mysterious power which we shall do well to enlist upon our side.' Dr Hodgson takes four points for consideration from the period covered by the Old Testament—that God is one, that He is creator of all things, that He is good, and that the Israelites are His chosen people. The first assertion does not imply that the Supreme Being stands alone; He never holds the field in primitive society to the exclusion of all other gods. 'If this be so, the significant feature in Jewish monotheism is not so much the assertion that there is one Supreme Being as that it is directly with this Supreme Being that in his religion man has to do.' The second assertion of Hebrew faith, that this Supreme Being is the sole Creator of all things, is the beginning of monotheism in the usual sense of the word. This belief appears in the eighth century B.C. in Amos, and in Second Isaiah it comes to full expression. The third step, the combination of the doctrine of creation with that of the goodness of God, was the most embarrassing. Inasmuch as it broke with the

efforts to propitiate the mysterious supernatural powers which might be at work in the universe, it crossed the line between superstition and reasonable religion. But there is a positive enrichment of the idea of revelation. 'Henceforward men were to treat their apprehensions of moral obligation as being for them the revelation of the mind and will of God.' This is illustrated by the stories of Nathan's rebuke of David, and Elijah's rebuke of Ahab for the murder of Naboth. Prophetic rebukes like these prepared the way for the 'thus saith the Lord' of the eighth-century prophets. The fourth point, that the Israelites are God's chosen people, is borne out by the fact that the events of their history are regarded as acts of God, in some way distinguishable from His activity in creation in general. From the second and third points arises the clash which is our chief theological problem—How evil could have come to exist, as it does, in the creation of God who is good. It is well to insist as Dr Hodgson does, that whether we believe in God or no, there remains for the philosopher the unresolved problem of the co-existence of good and evil in one universe. But from the Christian thinkers have come certain rays of light which shine upon the dark mysteries of evil. Our Creator cares for us with an unfathomable intensity. 'Whether we walk by the path of philosophy, of theology, or of religion, we draw nearer to our goal, when we think of the ultimate reality not as It, but as Him of whom the Prophet wrote: "He said, surely they are my people. . . . So He was their Saviour, in all their affliction He was afflicted." (Isa. 63<sup>8</sup>, 9.)' 'We grasp the true uniqueness of the Christian revelation when as a result we say, "Yes, now we see for ourselves that this is the story of God rescuing His creation from evil."' The lectures are full of paragraphs such as these, and they are supported by closely reasoned argument. I have tried to select one lecture which I have enjoyed and admired most—and I have failed. If readers want guidance about 'Eschatology' (and everybody ought to welcome fresh light on that), they will turn to Lecture 9, where after fourteen pages the argument leads to the conclusion that 'the fact is that both individually and corporately we are conscious of being made for a perfection which is unattainable in any imaginable conditions of space and time'. Then follows a passage from a book by Oliver Quick explaining why Christianity alone holds the key to this mystery. 'No final or perfect good is attainable in this world at all. For only by the sacrifice which death seals can the work of love be brought to finality. . . . And thus it is that Christianity, alone among the religions and philosophies of the world, succeeds in eliciting from death, i.e. from the actuality of dying, a unique value, so that it is found to make a positive and necessary contribution to the perfection of created life. Other philosophies of immortality suggest either that death is in some way unreal, or that it constitutes merely a release for the spirit through the dropping off of the material body. Not so Christianity. To it, dying is an essential part or moment in that act through which love accomplishes the 'self-sacrifice which issues in eternal life.' This is a notable series of Gifford Lectures. They sit closely to real life and true religion. They are outspoken, and therefore more readable than much modern philosophy. They throw fresh light on ancient problems. Above all they are the work of an honest man never despairing of the joyous end of his perilous journey.

*La Seconde Épître de Saint Paul aux Corinthiens*, by Jean Héring (Delachaux et Niestlé, Sw. Fr. 8.80). Last July we reviewed the commentary by Professor Charles Masson in this series, on the Thessalonian Epistles. Now (January 1958) appears a commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, which many students regard as perhaps the most difficult of the Pauline Epistles. The author, Professor Héring, came to be known in this country by his great book, *Le Royaume de Dieu et sa Venue* (1937). Like all his work, this commentary is lucid, frank, lively, and immensely learned. The pages are large, but there are only just over a hundred of them, and every page is packed with interest. He adopts a conjecture in 3<sub>17</sub> which, if it could be



accepted, would solve a problem hitherto insoluble. In 3<sub>17b</sub>, remove the comma which appears after κυρίου and place it after πνεῦμα. This part of the verse will then be translated: 'Where the Spirit is, there is the freedom of the Lord.' The former part of the verse, which identifies 'The Lord is the Spirit', by a very slight addition, now becomes οὗ δε ὁ κυριος, τὸ πνεῦμα ἐστιν. The translation of the last two verses of this difficult chapter would run almost as smoothly and as elegantly as Dr Héring's native French: 'But where the Lord is, the Spirit is. And where the Spirit is, there is the freedom of the Lord. We all mirror the glory of the Lord, with face unveiled, and so we are being transformed into the same likeness as Himself, passing from one glory to another, for this comes through the Spirit of the Lord.' The emendation of the text in the second part of verse 18 was made by an Anglican priest, Graverol, and was first published in 1686. The merit of this suggestion is that we obtain a perfect parallelism of style and thought between the two parts of the verse.

*The Christian Tradition and the Unity we seek*, by Albert C. Outler (O.U.P., 12s. 6d.). This contribution to the literature of the 'ecumenical movement' is written by a Methodist scholar in the U.S.A. He is fully equipped for his task. Into 160 pages he has packed a wealth of learning and understanding. He understands very well that, within the past half-century, we have 'achieved more actual and concrete results in drawing the Churches together than in the eleven centuries which stretch back from our own to the Photian Schism (867-77)'. We have found that our agreements are almost always greater and more important than the controversialists had thought. Professor Outler has speedily grasped the religious value of that fact. It is of even greater import that as Christian leaders have met, without any loss of loyalty to their several communions, their fresh experience of common worship and study has given them fresh friends, and transformed their outlook altogether. In his last chapter, Professor Outler sums up the unity which we are seeking. First and foremost, it is the fullness and fulfilment of the unity that we have. We have a partial unity in faith and teaching. We ought to push on, even if it will be a minor error or misunderstanding that thwarts our progress. Second, we seek a unity in Christian hope. Third, we seek a fullness in our unity of Christian worship, and this must mean a sacramental communion and some sort of common and representative ministry. 'Finally, we seek a unity in love, God's love which calls out our love for all our brethren.' Between these chapters, the first and the last, lie discussions on 'The Christian Sense of History', 'The Christian Event and the Christian Community', and 'The Christian Tradition'. This book is alive. It will repay many who are not theological students. They will be attracted by the devotional tone and the intellectual strength of the argument. Above all, Professor Outler writes in the light of 'the great new fact of our time'. He knows and confesses, on many a page and in divers tones, that Jesus Christ is the Event that creates the community, and that the power of the Holy Spirit is bringing to each new Christian in each new generation something of His own Pentecost.

*Prophets of Judah, The Chosen Nation; Book Three*, by Elsie Broadie (Religious Education Press, 6s. 6d.). 'Miss Broadie's work seems to be admirably adapted to its purpose. It gives the historical setting in outline, and it brings out the essence of the message which the prophets delivered and makes clear its relevance to the situation. Religion is seen to be less the acceptance of propositions about God than the response to His goodness in the reflexion in life of His own Spirit.' It is well to remember these words from the Foreword by Professor H. H. Rowley. The chapters describing the messages of each prophet and their setting are as clear as a bell. The exercises on each chapter are most varied and interesting.

*The Ride from Hell: A Poem-Sequence*, by Herbert Palmer (Hart-Davis, 12s. 6d.). This beautifully-produced book ought to be regarded as a prophetic call. There is something here of the fortieth chapter of Isaiah. Indeed, the author knows what

genuine religion is, and what great poetry is. He was brought up in Methodist manses in the 'eighties, and he married the daughter of a Wesleyan Methodist minister. He calls us to notice that 'This is a little book of Heaven and Hell'. His poetry is strangely welcome. He actually tells—

*in the accents of dazed earth  
Of strength that built, and weakness that brings down,  
Of love that made, and unfaith that annuls,  
Disintegration and the ascending Fear.*

There is real poetry in 'The counsels to a Young Poet' (pp.15-16). They are given to stir to flame a larger theme than that framed on Mount Sinai:

*Rather the Good and Ill not swiftly seen,  
Descended Good, Ascended Ill, the times,  
And Good and Ill that interlock in Hell;  
Then Heaven which conquers Ill and rescues Good.*

There is a rich simplicity in the poems and no striving after effect. They are rather like the best Australian poetry. There is a fresh air of springtime pervading the whole book. He uses the luminous words 'starlight', 'crystal flame', 'fay-light of beauty'. He delights in 'the kindling colours of the day' (p.36), and can weave a lovely phantasy of colour, as in the Prologue (p.11). He can 'build up' a poem in the same way as artists used to arrange 'still-life' for a picture (p.43), though 'still-life' is hardly the word to associate with the passionate cry to God contained in the 'Prayer for the Lost'. But certainly the whole poem is working up to God, 'the peak of bliss'. I could wish Frederic Luke Wiseman were alive to declaim this poem as if it were a hymn. But it is both.

*William Russell Maltby: Obiters Scripta*, selected and arranged by Francis B. James, with an appreciation by J. Alexander Findlay (Epworth Press, 7s. 6d.). Six years ago this anthology appeared of some of the prose writings of one who can justly be called a genius. His own particular type of genius was impatient of long theological books. In 1915, when the series 'Manuals of Fellowship' was being planned, he would honour a junior minister by saying suddenly, 'I think this is the man to give us twenty-eight immortal pages on Forgiveness'. Rather disconcerting at first, of course! The junior might not know whether W.R.M. wasn't playing with him. Then Maltby would explain that the books on the Atonement that had life and power, were alive in virtue of some twenty or thirty pages in them. 'Look at Denney, R. W. Dale, Macleod Campbell, Moberly.' The junior would capitulate. Henceforth he was the slave of that ideal. And if genius includes an infinite capacity for taking pains, W.R.M. had it. His pattern of perfection for every 'Manual of Fellowship' was summed up in a single sentence: 'In substance, brevity, and beauty, each Manual should resemble a sonnet.' *O si sic omnes!* 'The Manuals from his own pen, especially the two entitled *The Meaning of the Cross* and *The Meaning of the Resurrection*, have left a mark on the minds of their thousands of readers which it is impossible to think can ever be effaced.' So says Professor J. Alexander Findlay. I do not know any parallel in this country to the success of those 'religious pamphlets'.

*Man and Wife Together*, by Kenneth G. Greet (Epworth Press, 4s. 6d.). Here indeed is value for money. The book is described on its title page as 'A Manual on Sex Education and Marriage Preparation'. It is meant for ministers and others with responsibilities and opportunities relating to marriage. The book is furnished with a Foreword by Dr Leslie Weatherhead, and with a list of experienced authorities who have helped Mr Greet in reading the book and making valuable suggestions. Among

these are Mr A. Joseph Brayshaw, the Rev. J. Crowlesmith, and the Principal of the National Children's Home, the Rev. J. W. Waterhouse. But the author must take the main praise. His work is a mingling of realism and reverence. It is to be recommended to every minister, because no minister can afford to be without the practical knowledge it gives—for instance, there are names and addresses of reputable adoption societies all over the country. But the strength of the book is in the chapters on 'Christian Responsibility', 'Sex Education', 'Marriage Preparation and Family Planning'. There is a mingling of good taste and good sense on a subject which is full of pitfalls.

*From Prophecy to Law*, by Norman J. Bull (Religious Education Press, 6s.). This book has been planned for secondary schools. It has a key-place in the overall scheme of the publishers, to provide a complete set of guide-books for the teachers. The former guide covered the period from the death of Solomon to the fall of Jerusalem (933-586 BC). This book continues the story of the transition (586-398 BC) from prophecy to law. There is, of course, a wide disparity between one school and another in the number of lessons available. But the guides are planned to leave the teacher completely free to adapt this material as he thinks fit. As far as quality is concerned, I should consider all these crisp chapters, so carefully written, so stimulating to the mind, to be fully worthy of the study of theological students preparing for the ministry. 'Verify your references.' 'Tis an old cry. If only the theological students and all who offer for any ministry would look up the dozen references on any sparkling page of Mr Bull's book every day for six months, there would be a greater mastery of the message of the Bible in the pulpit, and perhaps a more enlightened knowledge of the Bible in the pew. 'Verify your references.' Mr Bull obviously expects that of the teachers. Why shouldn't it be forthcoming from theological students?

*That They may have Life*, by Edward Rogers (Epworth Press, 7s. 6d.). This is a most unusual Lenten book. It presents us with a picture of a strong mind wrestling with the language of devotion, and finding that 'even the tenderest and most sacred emotions may be distorted and diverted by the unrelenting cunning of evil'. For example, some most earnest preaching conveys the impression that somehow the Crucifixion has overshadowed the Resurrection. But the earliest Christian preaching was about Jesus and the Resurrection. 'The Cross was part of the plan of God. The plan was for the redemption of sinful men, and redemption means entering from death into life.' The second chapter, with its title, 'Giver of Life', is full of unexpected phrases and illustrations and droll turns of speech. We hear, for example, about 'The Widows' Pension Scheme of the Apostolic Church', and in the passage about the mighty wind and the shaking (Acts 2, 4<sub>31</sub>) we are told: 'There is not really very much in those descriptions to remind us of a gentle voice, soft as the breath of even'; 'The dominant note is of the breaking-in of overmastering power.' The third chapter opens with a phrase from a book by the Dean of King's College, Cambridge: 'The Holy Spirit enables men to become themselves.' This is grounded, of course, in the description of the penitence of the prodigal son: 'When he came to himself.' This assumes that there is a real self to which a man has not come till he has seen the ugliness and ingratitude of his ways. After the third chapter there is a refreshing interlude for criticism, followed by chapters on 'Rejecting Life', 'The Pain of Life', and 'Pilate and the Priests'. Mr Rogers sustains the level of interest: 'A British official examining a Cypriot priest accused of complicity with Eoka terrorists would understand Pilate's attitude very well. The safe way was to work to rule.' This chapter has been a joy to read. 'Second Critical Interlude', 'One Step Enough?', 'Serving Society', 'Quest for Truth', 'The Yoke of Christ', 'The Sufficient End'—these are the titles of the five remaining chapters, 'leading to the goal of a liberated family of the human children of God'. 'Always He speaks to persons, and always to the situations in which they are.' Always Mr Rogers works out his religious beliefs

with the summons ringing in his ears to the holy war on poverty, hunger, ignorance, and disease.

*The Person of Christ in New Testament Teaching*, by Vincent Taylor (Macmillan, 21s.). No scholar writing in English in our time has served the cause of New Testament theology more devotedly or more brilliantly than Vincent Taylor. Even when presiding over the great theological college at Headingley, he found time to write the gigantic (and the best) commentary on St Mark's Gospel. In this latest book he is true to himself. He tells us exactly what he is doing; we know precisely where he stands. Oh that we could say the same of Bultmann! In his preface he points out the two roads open to the writer on the New Testament doctrine. The older method is to set forth the teaching of individual writings in order, and to do this in chronological succession, as far as possible. The more recent way begins with the teaching of Jesus, as far as it can be ascertained, and then examines the thought of the primitive communities, passing on to consider in succession the Epistles of St Paul, the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Johannine writings, and the Pastoral and Catholic Epistles. Dr Taylor uses both methods. In an exegetical section (pp.3-151) he examines the various New Testament writings. In a historical and theological study (pp.155-306) he traces the movements of thought in the period. Chapters VIII and IX, which are devoted to the modern interpretation of the Johannine Gospel and Epistles, are the best examples of his exegetical power. So many recent commentaries have claimed his attention, and their quality is so high, that he might be forgiven if he had stumbled. But no, his steps are as sure as ever. He considers the case for assigning 1 John to a different author from the writer of the Fourth Gospel 'not established'. But with regard to the use of the term 'Logos' in the Prologue, he considers, as does C. H. Dodd, that we must for its origin look to the Greek conception of the creative and revealing Logos. This is in many respects similar to that of Philo. Thus Dr Taylor does not hold the once popular view that the origin of the conception must be looked for only in the Old Testament. But the full strength of Dr Taylor's book is only reached in the chapters on the 'Divine Consciousness of Jesus', 'The Christology of the Primitive Christian Communities and its Limitations', the 'Contribution of the Great New Testament Writers', 'Christology and the Trinity', 'Christology and Kenosis', 'Christology and Psychology', and the concluding chapter, 'Towards a Modern Christology'. He considers some kind of 'kenotic' theory inevitable. 'The Christology which seems most in accord with the teaching of the New Testament is the doctrine that in becoming man, the Son of God willed to renounce the exercise of divine prerogatives and powers, so that in the course of His earthly existence, He might live within the necessary limitations which belong to human finitude' (p.287). The objections are met by the arguments of Bishop Gore, Dr Forsyth, and Dr Mackintosh, but Dr Taylor does not shrink from dealing with the strongest objection of all. This is the charge that, on the presuppositions of a kenotic Christology, the divine consciousness of the Son is not always at the same pitch of intensity, and at times may even be in eclipse. 'I have suggested that Christ's consciousness of Sonship was at its zenith in high moments of revelation and intuition, and in hours of prayer and communion with His Father. But this claim does not mean that at other times there was no remembrance of these experiences.' And then Dr Taylor makes a fine use of one of the greatest passages in Robert Browning's *Ring and the Book*, when the Pope describes a lightning flash which reveals the city of Naples—

*There lay the city, thick and plain with spires,  
And, like a ghost dis-shrouded, white the sea.*

There are parallels in the life of Jesus, but with the difference that the flash is followed by a permanent glow. Put this passage side by side with the careful pages in the last

section of the chapter, 'The Emergence of the Divine Consciousness of Jesus' (pp.187-9), and you will have a Christology which is a *kerygma*, and a *kerygma* that saves.

*The Death of Christ: The Cross in New Testament History and Faith*, by John Knox (Abingdon Press, via Epworth Bookshop, \$2.75). The gifted author has written his masterpiece. Not that every reader will agree with him. He glides from problem to problem, disturbing nearly all the solutions which we have found so comfortable, and bidding us think again. For example, take the illustration which Dr Knox uses (p.18) to show in the Gospel evidence a tendency to play down the Roman part in it, and to emphasize correspondingly the part taken by Jews. He invites us to imagine that nothing was really known to have happened, except that a few Roman officers, responsible for the maintenance of public order, quietly arrested Jesus one night, hearing talk about the kingdom of God, and after a brief trial before the procurator, put Him to death as a possible trouble-maker along with others of the same kind. Dr Knox asks: 'Can we not be sure that even if the incident as first known had been thus simple and straightforward, it would not have remained so in the Church's tradition? The crucifixion of Jesus was almost at once to become the focus of attention in both faith and worship, the centre of meaning in the whole Christian gospel. It is inconceivable that such an event of such supreme significance should have happened quickly, casually, inconspicuously'. I am afraid that this argument does not seem convincing. It is still inconceivable that the execution of Jesus could have taken place 'in a corner', the fame of Jesus being what it was, and the mass of pilgrims from Galilee being what they were. This secret way of making away with Jesus would have been the surest way of provoking an open revolt, and a revolt was what any efficient officer of the Emperor wished to avoid. The Gospel evidence that Jesus taught the sufferings of the Son of Man is regarded by Dr Knox, and by Bultmann, as 'a Marcan contribution to the tradition'; it does not go back to the mind of Jesus'. But Dr Knox knows that we cannot leave the matter there. As firmly as Dr Taylor he holds (p.107) that 'there was something extraordinary and unique in the consciousness of Jesus, and the later Christological development cannot be historically understood unless that something is taken into account.' This 'something' belongs to the Church's memory of Jesus Himself. The evidence goes to show not that He *claimed* to be a prophet any more than He wished to be regarded as answering to the current conceptions of the Messiah. But the real question is whether His consciousness of God's will and God's relation with Himself was of the kind characteristic of the prophet. Dr Knox affirms that the prophetic consciousness of Jesus would have been an aspect of His realization of the unique meaning of His times. He had been set in the midst of the great moment of all history, and had been given to see its significance. Upon Him had been laid the tremendous responsibility of declaring its meaning to all the nation. The pages which follow (118-23) are among the richest in the book, and cannot be summarized. The third section of the book has three chapters ('Centre and Symbol', 'Myths and Meanings', and 'The Cross and the Christian Way'). An Appendix follows (pp.175-182) on 'Rudolf Bultmann and Demythologization'. It must have been difficult for Dr Knox to answer the question: 'How far do you share Bultmann's views?' Dr Knox, even in his critical judgements, lays an immense load on the Church. Bultmann hardly mentions the word in his Essay in *Kerygma and Myth*. Again Dr Knox detects a strange inadequacy in Bultmann's treatment of the Resurrection. Dr Knox asks whether Bultmann is urging theological writers to dispense with 'myths', in the widest sense of that much-abused word. For an answer, we still are waiting.

'*The Christian Approach*' Series (Edinburgh House, 2s. 6d. each). The first two titles have made their appearance and the series is planned to include also the Christian Approach to the Buddhist, the Animist, the Communist, the Muslim, and the Humanist. If all are as sympathetic and courteous as *The Christian Approach to the Hindu*



by Jack C. Winslow and *The Christian Approach to the Jew* by H. L. Ellison, they deserve a wide circulation. The discriminating Chapters IV, V, VI and VII shew the way forward—'Modern Religious Movements', 'The Christian Approach', 'Indian Christian Theology', 'The Indian Church'. The bibliography would have been greatly enriched by the addition of the works of Dr Marcus Ward. But Christians will be grateful for the clear-cut sentences explaining the crucial difficulties in the way of a Hindu who contemplates the choice of Christ rather than Hinduism, as a tolerable alternative to Karl Marx (p.41). 'The Christian, unless he is prepared to deny the very heart of his faith must make a claim for the Founder of his religion which no Hindu can tolerate . . . that Jesus Christ is the unique revelation of God to our world.' That is the great divide. It can only be crossed by the way of full personal commitment. And there is one further step—'This act of surrender must be sealed by the outward confession of baptism. This is where the hardest cost has to be faced, at least by a caste Hindu.' *The Christian Approach to the Jew* is an avowed appeal by Mr H. L. Ellison to the individual Christian. He assumes that his reader has found God's riches in Jesus Christ. 'When I come to meet a Jew, I must be prepared to say as occasion serves: My people has sinned. My Church has sinned. . . . However little I may like it, the Jew believes that he has riches he can share with me, and he is not likely to want to hear of mine unless I sincerely wish to know his.' This is the Christian temper. I will add one comment. Anyone who has been privileged to share in the Passover service will know that the riches of that rite, reverently carried out in its entirety, will not only pour a like richness and reverence into his own family life, but will also understand Jesus better. There is no mention of the Council of Christians and Jews, and the great work already performed in mutual sympathy and understanding. The individual could help there.

---

#### NOTABLE ARTICLES IN PERIODICALS

*The Congregational Quarterly*, January 1958.

The Priesthood of Believers, by W. F. Lofthouse.

A Universally Acceptable Ministry, by the Right Reverend A. M. Hollis.

Christian Communication, by R. T. Brooks.

Christianity and Colonialism in British East Africa, by John Ferguson.

*The Harvard Theological Review*, October 1957.

The Shorter Text of Luke, 22<sup>18-20</sup>, by Henry Chadwick.

Dante and the Pauline Modes of Vision, by J. A. Mazzeo.

Eusebius and the Gospel Text, by M. Jack Suggs.

A Note on the Format of the Pauline Corpus, by John Knox.

*Interpretation*, October 1957.

A symposium on the theme that Paul's Epistle to the Romans is appropriate for the development of a theology for the Christian; contributions from William Hamilton, Edwin Lewis,

K. B. Cully, H. C. Phillips.

*do.*, January 1958.

Jesus in Relation to Believing Men, by Paul Davies.

In Search of Christ's Presence, by Otto A. Piper.

The Servant Motif in the Synoptic Gospels, by James L. Price.

*Theology Today*, January 1958.

Ethical Relativism and Popular Morality, by W. B. Easton.

Factors in Character Formation, by T. Francis Glasson.

European Industrial Life and the Bible, by E. H. Robertson.

Reviews of H. Knight's translation of Niesel's book *Theology of Calvin*, by W. G. Hards; and of Geraint Jones' *Christology and Myth in the New Testament*, by Otto A. Piper.

*The Hibbert Journal*, January 1958.

Gilbert Murray, O.M., A Personal Tribute by I. S. R. Langdale.

Salvation, Mithraic and Christian, by S. G. F. Brandon.

Obstacles to Religious Belief, by K. G. Collier, and Religious Assertions, by J. B. Wilson.

---

# Our Contributors

- FRANK BAKER**  
B.A., B.D., PH.D.  
Methodist minister. Secretary of the Wesley Historical Society and of the International Methodist Historical Society. Member of the World Methodist Council. Author of several works on Methodist history, and contributor to various journals.
- RUPERT E. DAVIES**  
M.A., B.D.  
Sometime Chaplain of Kingswood School, Bath, after working in two Bristol Methodist Circuits became tutor in Church History and the History of Christian Doctrine at Didsbury College, Bristol, in 1952. Author of *The Problem of Authority in the Continental Reformers*, and *Why I am a Protestant*, etc.
- G. THACKRAY EDDY**  
M.A., B.D.  
Methodist minister. Sometime Muirhead Post-Graduate Scholar in Philosophy, Birmingham University. Examiner in Theology and Philosophy of Religion, Handsworth College. Member, Doctrinal Committee of Appeal.
- R. NEWTON FLEW**  
M.A., D.D.  
Moderator of Free Church Federal Council, 1945-6. President, Methodist Conference 1946-7. Principal of Wesley House, Cambridge, 1937-55. Author and Editor of various important theological books.
- PERCIVAL HADFIELD**  
M.A., B.D., PH.D., F.R.A.I.  
Vicar of Youlgreave, Derbyshire. Author of two books on Anthropology, viz. *The Savage and His Totem and Traits of Divine Kingship in Africa*.
- JOHN HESTER**  
M.A.  
Anglican Priest. Sometime Exhibitioner of St Edmund Hall, Oxford. Later was Supervising Officer, Army Education, Oxfordshire, Berkshire and Buckinghamshire. Is Editor of *Christian Drama*, a magazine published by the Religious Drama Society of Great Britain. Is shortly to be Secretary of the Actors' Church Union.
- CHARLES W. H. JOHNSON**  
M.A.  
Studied Classics and Logic at Cambridge University; appointed Official Lecturer, National Gallery, 1930. Author of *English Painting* (1932); *The Growth of Twelve Masterpieces* (1947) and *The Language of Painting* (1949).
- W. F. LOFTHOUSE**  
M.A., HON. D.D.  
Methodist minister. President of the Wesleyan Conference, 1929. Sometime Tutor and later principal at Handsworth College. Author of works on Theology and Sociology.
- EDWARD D. MILLS**  
F.R.I.B.A.  
Architect; R.I.B.A. Bossum Research Fellow and Member of the R.I.B.A. Council. Principal architectural work in Great Britain and overseas includes Methodist Churches; Schools, Research and Industrial Buildings; Flats; British Industries Pavilion, Brussels Exhibition 1958; Anglican Cathedral, Mbale, Uganda. Publications: *The New Architecture in Great Britain*; *The Modern Church*, etc.
- CYRIL N. OGDEN**  
Trained for the Anglican Ministry at King's College, London, and was ordained in 1939. During the war served as Chaplain in the R.A.F. Became increasingly concerned in the relationship between religion and mental health. Is a qualified Speech Therapist, and combined this with some parish work.
- JOSEPH W. POOLE**  
M.A.  
Rector of Merstham, Surrey. Born 1909; chorister of St George's Chapel, Windsor. Organ Scholar of Jesus College, Cambridge. Precentor of Canterbury Cathedral 1938-49.
- LUDWIG ROTT**  
Minister of the Methodist Church in Germany. Educated at Kirchliche Hochschule Neuendettelsau, University of Erlangen and Methodist Theological Seminary, Frankfurt on Main. Since 1957 has been minister of the German Methodist Mission in London.
- GORDON S. WAKEFIELD**  
M.A., B.LITT.  
Methodist minister at Gosforth in the Newcastle-upon-Tyne (Brunswick) Circuit. Author of *Puritan Devotion*, the Fernley-Hartley Lecture for 1957.
- BASIL WILLEY**  
M.A., F.B.A., HON. LITT.D.  
Professor of English Literature, University of Cambridge since 1946; Fellow of Pembroke College. Visiting Professor, Columbia University, New York, 1948-49. Author of numerous books including *Introduction to Thoreau's 'Walden'*, *Christianity Past and Present*.

ciety  
nber  
s on

king  
urch  
bury  
ority  
tc.

holar  
ology  
nber,

dent,  
ouse,  
rtant

s on  
its of

Hall,  
ation,  
or of  
rama  
f the

ointed  
nglish  
7) and

1929.  
ollege.

ber of  
Great  
hools,  
ustries  
nedral,  
Great

on, and  
lain in  
onship  
Speech

george's  
bridge.

ated at  
rlangen  
Main.  
Mission

n-Tyne  
ernley-

re since  
Colum-  
s books  
ity Past

ished by